

THE
**SOCIALIST
STANDARD**

1920

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 185 Vol. 16.]

LONDON, JAN., 1920.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

BALD AND UNCONVINCING.

ALSO "THERE ARE OTHERS."

Capitalist cant and humbug still manifest themselves at every turn, and the Bolshevik movement still supplies them with some of the finest opportunities for such manifestation.

**That Fine
Thing—
Opportunity.**

Almost weekly some female member of the class who have kept Russian soil soaked with blood (working-class blood, of course) for generations, escapes from the "clutches" of the Bolsheviks, and brings her troubles to these shores. Invariably she has a harrowing tale of the atrocities of "the terror." She usually has managed to pick up a document of fearful import—Bolshevik army orders relating to the taking of women and girls for sinister purposes are the most common; we all know how carelessly the "Reds" leave such things lying about the streets!—which is very thoughtful of her, for it enables her perhaps otherwise unconvincing narrative to be published with illustrations.

But also invariably, when the Russian Countess (all the princesses have long since been laid in their nameless graves, with unmentionable accompaniments) has told her tale of horror, she has nothing to show in substantiation thereof except her ropes of pearls and her jewels (which the "Reds" might have found had they taken

**Unfortunate
Lack of
Evidence.**

the trouble to search her) and her precious document—which might quite possibly be a forgery. Invariably she has no mangled limbs to display before the public whom she expects to swallow so much. She does not hobble along on one leg as do so many poor fellows of the working class in this country and others. She gets about very well, thank you; and if she did lose forty pounds of fat owing to the Bolshevik horrors (and not, mark you, because she had to fare as other people in a land which she herself

describes as starving) she soon finds it again among her fellow parasites in the West End. For, happily enough, all these horrors which she relates (even to people of "birth and breeding" being compelled to work) have happened—to other people!

**The
Latest
Witnesses—**

Not Russian countesses, but two Irish "girls," are the latest to escape from that other "distressful country" that is not Ireland. They come with the same wearying tale of atrocities that have been inflicted upon—others. They have (the "Daily Chronicle" of Jan. 3 informs us) "a number of terrible photographs, showing the horrors of the Red regime." And "It is impossible henceforward to hope that such stories of the Red Terror may prove to have been exaggerated; the credibility of these new witnesses is beyond question."

And yet—there are some strange features about their narrative. One might start with those "terrible photographs." It is a strange thing that they do not publish them. What have they brought them to this country for, if they are not to be seen? Is it in order to talk about them, and to add to the famous Government collection of Russian photographs which

are not fit for publication—for
—Have fear somebody should identify
the Old them as pictures of outrages
Failing. perpetrated upon Russian workers
under the Czarist regime?

It is strange reading also that two ladies, one of whom had "lost 40lb. in weight as a result of her sufferings," and the other of whom looks, from her published photograph, as though her sister's loss has been her gain, could "run for five miles," as the "Daily Chronicle" reports that they finally did, to escape the Red Terror.

It is strange, also, that one of these women

could lay (sic) on her "bed with the door barricaded" while "ten Bolsheviks occupied the room next to mine. . . . There night after night they carried on drunken orgies of an unspeakable character," and yet be able to say (as both she and her sister do) that she was "never subjected to personal violence." It is strange again how she knew the exact number, when there were so many, of Bolsheviks in that room if she had to hide herself away from them, or that they could be so very terrible if she did not.

It is strange yet again that if the iron of these dread doings had bitten so deep into her soul—not to speak of her "weight"—the lady had a thought to spare for the observation which is replaced with points in the above quotation. That observation was: "There was a beautiful drawing-room full of beautiful furniture." If the fact that Bolsheviks were holding "drunken orgies" in rooms and among furniture where only the rich had carried on theirs, is a crime of the Bolsheviks or a trouble of the lady, we may judge at once the standard by which she appraises both the villainy of the "Reds" and the depth of her own "sufferings."

It is strange, further, that these two ladies "have been in Kieff during each period of Bolshevik rule." One would have thought that one experience of this "nightmare" was enough, and that they would have seized the first opportunity of clearing out of the danger zone. But they appear to have cleared out only when one of them was detected in hiding Russian officers, in other words taking an active part in the struggle against the Bolsheviks. A similar participation in warfare in any other country has its prescribed penalty. The ladies were wise to scoot.

And now for the particular horrors which the "credibility of these new witnesses" puts beyond question.

When the Reds had departed one of the ladies went to a sort of human slaughter house, where "in the garden 127 nude and mutilated corpses, including those of some women, were flung into a hole." Obviously, she could not count these 127 bodies all flung into one hole, so it is clear that the unquestionable credibility with which the capitalist editor of our capitalist contemporary so lightly guarantees the unconvincing narrative must be made to cover even second-hand information.

Such, indeed is shown to be the case as the story proceeds, for we are told that "the man who removed the bodies from the shed told a horrible story of what he described as the staircase of death. "It seems [seems, mark you] that the victims first had to strip and then form up in line with arms folded.

"First one line had to lie on their faces, and they were then shot.

"Then the second row filed in and took their places, just behind the first row; and so row after row of corpses was piled up until there was what he describes as a staircase of bleeding bodies reaching almost to the ceiling of the shed."

So the lady's credibility is to guarantee the truth of what another party told her, even!

But there is a fly in the ointment, for it is obvious that the proceeding as stated could not result in "a staircase of bleeding bodies reaching almost to the ceiling of the shed." The geometry of the thing is all wrong.

However, it matters little what the trimmings were. It would be strange indeed if the Bolsheviks, at war and pressed on every hand, did not find occasion to put some backs up against a wall. And stripped of all its embroidery, that is all it amounts to. In the reports of their opponents parallel cases are thus sententiously recorded: "Many Bolsheviks were captured and executed." And it ill becomes those who took part in the filling of ten million graves all over the world, to whine because the process which they set in motion does not cease at their command.

But the seal is placed on the hypocrisy of the ruling class by the facts revealed by the inquiry into certain happenings in India, and the cool and even callous way in which those facts are accepted by our masters' Press. Nothing that has yet been alleged against the Bolsheviks in any way compares with or rivals for sheer ferocious animal brutality the confessed and even vaunted butchery of 500 natives by a British officer. In a country where that awful specimen of bloody-minded savagery had no other right at all to be save the right of the "mailed fist," and in their own village, some thousands of people demonstrated in defiance of their conquerors' orders. How the British apostle of "frightfulness" hurried to the scene eager for the bloodletting; how he deployed his men on a neighbouring hilltop, and in a few brief seconds had them pouring "rapid fire" into the crowd; how he ceased the butchery, not when the crowd dispersed, not when 500 fell dead and 2,000 wounded, but when he ran out of ammunition; and how he then marched his men away from the scene without attempting to give any assistance to his victims (it was not his business, he said): all this is told in the capitalist Press. We have no need to resort to suspect sources for that information. And these revelations come to hand at the opportune moment to form an effective reply to the tales of Bolshevik barbarity. A. E. JACOMB.

"THE MASTER(S) KEY."

The high priest of Nonconformity—Dr. John, Clifford—reached his 83rd birthday recently and was duly interviewed by a "Star" correspondent. Some very amusing opinions on the "Labour Outlook" were expressed by Dr. Clifford. To quote the "Star" (16.10.19):

LABOUR OUTLOOK.

Dealing with the situation in the Labour world, Dr. Clifford said he thought the outlook was healthy and reassuring.

"What is necessary is the internationalisation of labour conditions. There are four classes of people that have to be considered, and it is only when they meet and try to arrange matters on just and sound principles that there can be harmony.

These four classes are the men with means, called capitalists; the men who have land and rents; the men who live on dividends and make their demand for their share on the profits of labour; and the men who are really doing the work. They all have just claims, and these claims can be met.

SPIRIT OF TRUST.

The great thing is to foster the spirit of trust. Nothing wrecks labour so much as distrust, and our business is to fight everything that is creative of distrust and to nourish and strengthen all that creates confidence.

Hence, the dissemination of the spirit of brotherhood is the key to and the secret of the full productiveness of industry and of the happiness of the world.

One would have thought that 83 years of experience in a world torn with social strife and the results of capitalist exploitation, and an ever-increasing class war caused by a damnable system based upon the enslavement and robbery of a propertyless working class, would have given him an insight into the fundamental fabric of society.

Unfortunately, the "internationalisation of labour conditions" necessary, in Dr. Clifford's opinion, is already accomplished, for everywhere the workers are wage slaves—exploited and robbed of the greater part of the wealth they alone produce. The "internationalisation of labour conditions" exists in the fact that the

WHOLE WORLD

is at present under the blighting, ruthless, influence of capitalism.

King Capital rules. The Earth is the capitalist's, and the fulness thereof. Unemployment, chronic poverty, overwork and exploitation, like the poor, are always with us. War after war is waged for the sacred rights of the profit-mongers.

Yet the outlook is "healthy and reassuring," says Dr. Clifford. What optimism! What frankness!

He mentally visualises, and tries to create, harmony harmony out of the inevitable social

discord; out of a chaos of conflicting interests, order.

But he brings no philosophy built out of facts, wherewith to formulate scientific proposals. There are many notes on the piano keyboard: the science of musical composition alone can arrange them to avoid discord and create music.

Amid essentially warring claims he cries

PEACE!

when there can be only strife.

Let us consider the validity of the "just claims" of the "four classes of men."

(1) The capitalists own all the means and instruments of wealth-production and distribution, essential to life. They produce as a class—nothing! They appropriate, nevertheless, all the wealth produced by their human, wealth-producing machines—the working class.

(2) The men who own lands and exact rents tax the community for living on and using that land, which rightfully should belong to the whole people.

(3) The men who live on dividends are simply unproductive, anti-social parasites. They live by appropriating a portion of the surplus-value created by the workers.

(4) "The men who are really doing the work" are the working class. Divorced from the land, and possessing no means and instruments of production, they have to sell, in order to gain their livelihood, the only thing they possess—their labour-power of hand or brain. That they sell as a commodity to their capitalist masters. They must either sell it or starve, and

MANY DO STARVE

because they are unable to sell their labour-power. They only sell it—in other words they only get work—when it suits the masters' purpose to employ them. They are compelled by economic conditions to accept the terms which the masters dictate, and for the time which they desire them to labour. They are employed, as the machine is, for the owners' use and benefit. As wage slaves their sole function is to create surplus-value.

Receiving on an average only sufficient to keep themselves and an average family in a state that just suffices to provide the continuity of efficient workers required by the exploiting class, the workers are used to produce far more wealth for their capitalist masters than they themselves receive in the form of wages. All the surplus-value—all the value, that is, which the worker adds to the material in excess of the amount of his wages—is appropriated by their exploiters.

The latter divide the spoils amongst other sections of non-producers.

A portion of the surplus-value, in the form of economic rent, goes to the idle landowners, etc. Interest goes to moneylenders, financiers, and the like, who also do not create wealth. Profit, the remaining portion of the surplus-value or unpaid labour, is appropriated by the employing capitalists.

Thus the result of the present system is that a whole band of plutocratic brigands exists on the proceeds of working class robbery, and the workers themselves are daily strengthening

THE BONDS THAT BIND THEM.

Result: the capitalists as a class grow ever richer, both absolutely and in relation to their wage slaves, and the poverty of the workers is deepened with their increasing exploitation.

Thus, in dealing with adamant facts, the Socialist smashes the fabled "identity of interest of Capital and Labour."

The "harmony" of those who are robbed and those who rob cannot be "arranged" on "just and sound principles"—even by Dr. Clifford and his fellow magicians. So long as the capitalist system continues there will be robbers and robbed, and so long as there are robbers and robbed there will be discord and strife.

Exploitation and the plunder of a propertyless class through the wages system is the very essence of the present system, and will accompany it to the end.

The pro-capitalist John Cliffords will also continue to be a characteristic of the capitalist regime as long as it endures. They help to support the rotten fabric of an effete social order. Their part is to obscure the issues, to be "all things to all men" and keep the workers docile and diligent while the shameless plundering proceeds.

"The great thing is to foster the spirit of trust," says Dr. Clifford. There is an old saying:

POOR TRUST IS DEAD,

Bad Pay killed him." The workers do all the work of the world, and get damnably paid for doing it! They have lost trust in their leaders and their kind masters: they are *beginning* to take their blinkers off and to see around them some of the facts of things as they are. Let them but study economics and Socialism, and then trust—THEMSELVES! The working class alone can and will effect its own emancipation.

"Our business is to fight everything that is creative of distrust," declares the hoary old dope merchant. We have been urged to "trust Asquith"; to "wait and see." We have had a notorious Welsh wizard conjuring up visions of "The Future"—a fantastic dream

that resolves itself into a future menace of dire reality to the workers. With ever-increasing poverty and distress, and an accentuated class struggle, with the price of necessities ever soaring and unemployment stalking the land, who amongst us can think the labour outlook "healthy and reassuring"?

Dr. Clifford can, and does. He holds "the Key to the secret of full productiveness of industry and of the happiness of the world." It is evidently the master-key that unlocks the door barring the way to Lloyd George's

"BEAUTIFUL NEW WORLD."

Or is it—the *Masters' Key*?

Yea, verily, it must be so, for by his doctrine the capitalists, the men who have land and rents and the men who live on dividends, "have all just claims," as well as "the men who are *really* doing the work."

That word "really" is most appropriate. It is amusingly used, too, to qualify things by implying that there are others who are not doing anything.

Dr. Clifford has hit the mark. There are men *really* doing the work. They are doing *all* of it because idlers do nothing to produce the wealth they appropriate.

The class that does *all* the work—the working class—receives the least benefit, which is a very fine example of "inverse proportion." But that state of affairs is not conducive to fostering a "spirit of trust."

It is because the workers keep a class of parasitic idlers in affluence that they themselves have to work so hard, so long, and for such a pitiful reward for their toil.

The "spirit of brotherhood between Capital and Labour" is an impossible thing to realise. The "full productiveness of industry" only means an increased production, and a consequent glut of the goods for which our exploiters must seek a market.

WAR AFTER WAR

has resulted through competition for markets. "Full productiveness" is inevitably bound to produce the usual over-production, the consequent stagnation and unemployment, the same old struggle for markets, and the next war.

No! Dr. Clifford's key is no key to better conditions for the workers. It is our masters' key that is used to help to increase the wealth and power of the capitalist class.

The "spirit of brotherhood" can only come with Socialism, when the means of wealth-production (even to-day socially produced) are socially owned and controlled for the use and benefit of all.

The master-key that opens the door to mankind's splendid future is **POLITICAL POWER.**

When the workers understand their present wage-slavery and the plundering of their class by the capitalist system, they will see also, if they study Socialism, that in freeing themselves from the bondage of capitalism they will set the whole world free. They will then

TRUST THEMSELVES

to do so. Organising on the economic field, in factory, workshop, and every sphere of toil, they will fit themselves for controlling wealth-production for society's needs and benefit. Organising, above all, on the political field for the capture and control of political power, they will, in obtaining it, hold the key to freedom in their hand, and will use it for the paramount purpose of establishing the Socialist Commonwealth. The World for the Workers!

GRAHAM MAY.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF SOCIALIST THEORY.

Contrary to what many people suppose, Socialism is based upon a very solid foundation of scientific formulæ. These scientific explanations of social phenomena, or in brief, theories, though not numerous, are of immense value to the cause of working class emancipation, for they give a proper direction to those longings and aspirations which must inevitably arise within a slave class not utterly beyond redemption, instead of leaving those worthy and very desirable emotions to the mercy and misdirection of uneducated sentiment. The writer proposes to briefly survey these theories in this series of articles, and to show their significance.

The first of the formulæ to come under our notice is that which goes by the name of the Materialist Conception of History, the formulation of which we owe to Marx and Engels, although the principle was independently discovered and expounded by Lewis Morgan, the great American sociologist.

The Materialist Concept is a key to the interpretation of history. As its name implies, it attributes to material things the cause of that ceaseless change which is the subject matter of history, and is directly opposed to other interpretations of history, which ascribe historical change to human and superhuman intelligence.

The Materialist Concept declares that the roots of social change are to be found in the means and methods by which society gets its livelihood. Society gets its living by production. Men "only produce when they work together in a certain way," says Marx ("Wage-Labour and Capital"). "In order to produce they mutually enter upon certain relations and conditions, and it is only by means of these rela-

tions that their relation to nature is defined, and and production becomes possible."

This being so, it is plain that the nature of those relations must be determined by the stage of development reached by the means and methods by which they get their livelihood. Let us find an example in the old threshing flail and the modern threshing machine.

The flail, being a non-expensive tool operated by one man, could be and was, at all events in the period which it typifies—the Middle Ages—owned by the man who operated it. It is clear, however, that the modern threshing machine cannot be owned by the operator, since it takes not one, but about a dozen men to operate it. It might be jointly owned by them all, in which case the relations set up between them would be those of partners; it might be owned by one of them, or by somebody who took no part in the working of it, in which case the relations between the operators and the owner would be those between employees and employer, or it might be owned by the community as a part of the socially-owned means of production, in which case an entirely new set of social relations would arise. The same relations, however, which arose out of men getting their living together with the flail (as one of the instruments of production) can never shape themselves out of the co-operative operation of the threshing machine.

It must not be taken that our example shows that what has converted the peasant, operating his own flail for his own benefit, and standing in a certain group of relations to those about him, into a wage worker operating a threshing machine for a master, is the development of the threshing tool into the threshing machine merely. As a matter of fact, of course, this development was a slow and tortuous process, and various means have been resorted to to knock grain out of the ear—treading out by oxen and threshing by horse-driven machines, for instance. The relation of wage worker and employer, also, developed generations before the modern threshing machine was invented. Indeed, it is quite plain that before the latter could become a practical proposition this one thing essential to its operation as a general means of production had to exist—a class of men who were willing to work for wages.

Nevertheless our example shows that the flail (the terms are used as symbols of the prevailing instruments of labour), as a means of enabling men to work for themselves, and the threshing machine, as a means of employing men for wages, are the foundation of two separate and utterly distinct sets of relations between men, social relations, in short.

A. E. J.

(To be Continued.)

PHRASE MAGIC.

"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore mankind always takes up only such problems as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation."—MARX.

The above remarks were the outcome of years of patient historical investigation by one of the greatest thinkers of modern times.

One of the conditions necessary for the disappearance of the present social order (capitalism) is the understanding of certain basic principles on the part of the working class. Until the workers as a whole understand the position they occupy in modern society and the only way out of that position (i.e., by class-conscious political action) another social order will not give place to the present one—in spite of fuming and foaming, wild words and empty phrases.

In our Declaration of Principles we lay down the few simple essential principles it is necessary to understand and act upon in order to achieve emancipation from wage slavery.

Briefly summed up these principles are as follows:

All social wealth is produced by the working class and owned by the master class. Between these two classes there is a class struggle which can only be abolished by the emancipation of the workers from wage-slavery; i.e., by the supplanting of capitalist private ownership by social ownership. This emancipation must be the work of the working class itself, and, as the capitalist class retains its position by the control of the machinery of government, the working class must organise to capture the political machinery in order to use it as the agent of emancipation. Finally, as all political parties represent class interests, the working-class political party must be hostile to all other parties.

These are the broadest principles that can be adopted by the working class to work out its emancipation. If action is taken outside these elementary principles the working class movement is plunged into a morass.

But these principles are too simple, open and definite to please those who like to walk about with theatrical expressions on their lips, and to

move on waves of emotion. Nor do they please the henchmen of the master class, who prefer the diffusion of confusion as such methods hinder the spread of Socialism.

Our position does not lend itself to highly coloured phrases or empty diatribes, hence the wild "Revolutionaries" (the dangerous livers of the S.L.P.) and popularity chasers steer clear of our party.

There are some people who have neither the patience to acquire knowledge nor the self control to follow the only course (slow though it may be) open to the class-conscious worker. Those to whom the writer alludes are the emotional, red-flag-waving individuals.

People of this type have cut a figure in past movements and exist in profusion to-day. They live in the limelight, mouthing all sorts of handy phrases—in fact empty phrases echoing from empty heads largely constitute their stock-in-trade and take the place of ideas and knowledge. So effective in stirring up emotion are these phrases that their users seldom attempt to get behind them to ascertain their true meaning.

The phrase wizards, with an inflated estimate of their own puny accomplishments, flourish in all the pseudo working-class parties of the present. They strive to play upon emotion and attract a large following by voicing their particular pet phrases and hazy notions, hurrying a bewildered group of supporters along with them to some misty land of promise—they don't know exactly where.

In the Chartist movement in England the "Revolutionary" raved and ranted, gained applause—and the movement suddenly collapsed. The inexorable laws of capitalism ground the Chartist movement to powder, and swept the popular "leaders" away.

About twenty years ago the I.W.W. was ushered in with a great flourish of trumpets, and all the would-be "revolutionists" hurried to the front, panting with excitement and gasping their fervid and frenzied phrases. The real facts of the situation, however, and the unsurmountable obstacles to "taking and holding the means of production" through so-called industrial action (or inaction!) soon shattered the movement into warring fragments.

At the present moment we have the same bogey and crowd-gathering business cropping up again. The new catch-cry is "government by the soviets." And again all the phrasemongers and "revolutionaries" are to the fore. Again they are trying to force the pace by appeals to emotion. But unfortunately for these soft-hearted, soft-headed, and excited hurricanes neither fine phrases nor good intentions will take the place of knowledge. Appeals to emo-

tion may bring a bloody shambles, but they cannot bring Socialism.

People of this kind imagine they can produce results with a wizard's wand. Although the mass of the workers are not prepared to accept Socialism at present, these people imagine that the magic word "Soviet" is going to perform miracles. One is reminded of the whimsical jokers who are going to sweep all obstacles aside with the ponderous word "Ergatocracy"!

Even if we assumed, for the sake of argument, that the Soviet system were applicable in the particular case of Russia, owing to Russia's historical development, would this prove that it was suitable to other countries where social development had been somewhat different? As a matter of fact, however, the "Soviet" wave is a striking example of how phrases are used to smother facts. "Soviet" means "council," but if this plain English word were used everybody would understand its significance—and the movement would be stripped of its glamour.

The emancipation of the working class must be accomplished by the working class itself; the working class will not emancipate itself until it desires Socialism; the working class will not desire Socialism until it has gained an understanding of the necessary principles. In other words, Socialism is impossible until the necessary knowledge is acquired by the workers. Therefore the work for Socialists to do is to diffuse knowledge as much as possible in the shape of an explanation of their principles.

The result of the recent elections throughout Europe is a crushing retort to the "get there quick" merchants. Had the majority of the workers desired Socialism there would have been a sweeping rejection of capitalist candidates, instead of which exactly the opposite has taken place.

Faced with these facts the "revolutionaries" strive to "get there" round the back way some how—to land the workers in a new society strictly on the q. t.!

However, another disillusionment is in store, and "all power to the Soviets" will run its course and collapse as all similar schemes have done before.

Working for Socialism is, by its very nature, steady, plodding, uphill work, strictly in accordance with the principle of the class struggle. Just as inexorably and inevitably as the capitalist system approaches the breaking point, the Socialist position gains ground among the workers, and at the proper historical time (when the workers want it) Socialism will succeed capitalism. As has already been pointed out, we cannot force the pace—we must work and wait.

In England, as a result of a long historical

development, we find certain means at hand with which the Social Revolution can be accomplished, but we also find that the workers have not yet reached the stage when they are prepared to utilise these means to their own advantage. No amount of misguided emotion can obscure this fact. The workers possess the weapon, in the political machinery, with which they can usher in Socialism—when they desire it.

In conclusion, the writer emphasises the fact that artfully worded and high-sounding phrases have always been used to mislead the workers and rally them to the support of the masters. In the English, French, and American revolutions the mass of the people fought out the battles to the cries of "Eternal Freedom," "The Inalienable Rights of Man," "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," and such phrases, but all these "rights" were eventually fused in the right of the privileged few to exploit the toiling masses. The masses gave their lives without question at the call to arms. No further back than the recent war a striking illustration was given, when, with the catch-cry of "The protection of small nationalities" the "heroes" of Amritsar and Lahore fame set a wave going that swept thousands of workers into the shambles. It is, therefore, essential to shun empty phrases as the plague.

A year ago a miserable attempt was made to bring about unity among those who had, year in year out, swindled and betrayed the working class. The basis of the attempt was phrases borrowed from Russia, the plan miscarried, but it illustrated the rottenness that permeates those groups that throw overboard the principle of the class struggle in order to engage in compromise.

Between the workers and the masters there is no common meeting ground, no half-way house. To be successful we must hold to the ground of the class struggle and fight the battle out to its ultimate conclusion on this solid ground. As George Meredith pithily put it in "The Magic Comedians": "Compromise is virtual death: it is the pact between cowardice and comfort under the title of expediency."

GILMAC.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

Be careful how you handle the SOCIALIST STANDARD. It is powerful stuff and is fatal to working-class political ignorance.

We see, then, that Blanqui is a revolutionary of another generation.

These conceptions of the march of revolutionary events have long become obsolete, at least for the German Workingmen's Party, and will not find much sympathy in France, except among the less mature or the more impatient labourers. We shall also note that they are placed under certain restrictions in the present programme. Nevertheless our London Blanquists agree with the principle that revolutions do not make themselves but are made; that they are made by a relatively small minority and after a previously conceived plan; and finally that they may be made at any time, and that "soon."

It is a matter of course that such principles will deliver a man hopelessly into the hands of all the self deceptions of a fugitive's life and drive him from one folly to another. He wants above all to play the role of Blanqui, "the man of action." But little can be accomplished by mere good will. Not every one has the revolutionary instinct and quick decision of Blanqui. Hamlet may talk ever so much of energy, he will still remain Hamlet. And if our thirty-three men of action cannot find anything at all to do upon what they call the field of action, then these thirty-three Brutuses come into a more comical than tragic conflict with themselves. The tragic of their situation is by no means increased by the dark mein which they assume, as though they were so many slayers of tyrants with stilettos in their bosoms, which they are not.

What can they do? They prepare the next "outbreak" by drawing up lists of proscription for the future, in order that the line of man, who took part in the Commune, may be purified. For this reason they are called "The Pure" by the fugitives. Whether they themselves assume this title I cannot say. It would fit some of them rather badly. Their meetings are secret, and their resolutions are supposed to be kept secret, although this does not prevent the whole French quarter from ringing with them next morning. And as always happens to men of action who have nothing to do, they become involved first in a personal, then in a literary, quarrel with a foe worthy of themselves, one of the most doubtful of the minor Parisian journalists, a certain Vermersch, who published during the Commune the "Pere Duchene," a miserable caricature of the paper published by Hebert in 1793. This noble creature replies to their moral indignation by calling all of them thieves or accomplices of thieves in some leaflet, and smothering them with a flood of Billingsgate that smells of the dunghill. Every word is an excrement. And it is with such opponents

that our thirty-three Brutuses wrestle before the public!

If anything is evident it is the fact that the Parisian proletariat, after the exhausting war, after the famine in Paris, and especially after the fearful massacres of May, 1871, will require a good deal of time to rest, in order to gather new strength, and that every premature attempt at a revolution would bring on merely a new and still more crushing defeat. Our Blanquists are of a different opinion.

The rout of the Royalist majority on Versailles forbodes to them "the fall of Versailles, the revenge of the Commune. For we are approaching one of those great historical moments, one of those great crises, in which the people, while seemingly sunk in misery and doomed to death, resume their revolutionary advance with new strength."

In other words, another outbreak will "soon" come. This hope for an "immediate revenge of the Commune" is not a mere article of faith with men who have set their minds upon being "men of action" at a time when there is absolutely nothing to be done in the sense which they represent, that of an immediate outbreak.

Never mind. Since a start will be made soon, they hold that "the time has come when every fugitive who still has any life in him should declare himself."

And so the thirty-three declare that they are: (1) atheists; (2) communists; (3) revolutionaries.

Our Blanquists have this in common with the Bakounists, that they wish to represent the most advanced, most extreme line. For this reason they often chose the same means as the Bakounists, although they differ from them in their aims. The point with them is, then, to be more radical in the matter of atheism than all others. Fortunately it requires no great heroism to be an atheist nowadays. Atheism is practically accepted by the European working men's parties, although in certain countries it may be of the same calibre as that of a certain Bakounist who declares that it was contrary to all Socialism to believe in God, but that it was different with the Virgin Mary, in whom every good Socialist ought to believe. Of the vast majority of the German Socialist working men it may even be said that mere atheism has been outgrown by them. This purely negative term does not apply to them any more, for they maintain no longer merely a theoretical, but a practical opposition to the belief in God. They are simply done with God; they live and think in the real world, for they are materialists. This will probably be the case in France also. But if it were not, then nothing would be easier than to see to it that the splendid French

materialist literature of the preceding century is widely distributed among the labourers, that literature in which the French mind has so far accomplished its best in form and content, and which, with due allowance for the condition of the science of their day, still stands infinitely high in content, while its form has never been equalled since.

But this cannot suit our Blanquists. In order to show that they are the most radical, God is abolished by them by decree, as in 1793: "May the Commune for ever free humanity from this ghost of past misery (God), from this cause of its present misery." (The non-existing God a cause!) "There is no room in the Commune for priests; every religious demonstration, every religious organisation, must be forbidden."

And this demand for a transformation of people into atheists by order of the star chamber is signed by two members of the Commune of the first place, that a multitude of things may be ordered on paper without being carried out, and in the second place, that persecutions are the best means of promoting disliked convictions. So much is certain, that the only service which may still be rendered to God to-day, is that of declaring atheism an article of faith to be enforced and of outdoing even Bismarck's anti-Catholic laws by forbidding religion altogether.

The second point of the programme is Communism.

Here we are more at home, for the ship in which we sail here is called "The Manifesto of the Communist Party, published in Feb. 1848." Already in the fall of 1872 the five Blanquists who withdrew from the International had adopted a Socialist programme, which was in all essential points that of the German Communism. They had justified their withdrawal by the fact that the International had refused to play at revolution making after the manner of these five. Now this council of thirty-three adopts this programme with its entire materialist conception of history, although its translation into Blanquist French leaves a good deal to desire, in parts where the "Manifesto" has not been almost literally adopted, as it has, for instance, in the following passage: "As the last expression of all forms of servitude, the bourgeoisie has lifted the mystic veil from the exploitation of labour, by which it was formerly obscured: Governments, religions, family, laws, institutions of the past and the present, finally revealed themselves in this society, reduced to the simple antagonism between capitalist and wage workers, as instruments of oppression, by the help of which the bourgeoisie maintains its rule and holds the proletariat down."

Compare with this "The Communist Manifesto," Section 1: "In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation. The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honoured and looked up to with reverend awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science into its paid wage labourers. The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation, etc."

But as soon as we descend from theory to practice, the peculiarity of the thirty-three manifests itself: "We are Communists because we want to reach our goal without stopping at any intermediate stations, at compromises, which merely defer the victory and prolong the slavery."

The German Communists are Communists because they clearly see the final goal and work towards it through all intermediate stations and compromises, which are created, not by them, but by historical development. And their goal is the abolition of classes, the inauguration of a society in which no private property in land and means of production shall exist any longer. The thirty-three, on the other hand, are Communists because they imagine that they can skip intermediate stations and compromises at their sweet will, and if only the trouble begins, as it will soon according to them, and they get hold of affairs, then Communism will be introduced the day after to-morrow. If this is not immediately possible, then they are not Communists.

What a simple-hearted childishness which quotes impatience as a convincing argument in support of a theory!

Finally the thirty-three are "revolutionaries."

In this line, so far as big words are concerned, we know that the Bakounists have reached the limit; but the Blanquists feel that it is their duty to excel them in this. And how do they do this? It is well known that the entire Socialist proletariat, from Lisbon to New York and Budapest to Belgrade, has assumed the responsibility for the actions of the Paris Commune without hesitation. But that is not enough for the Blanquists: "As for us, we claim our part of the responsibility for the executions of the enemies of the people" (by the Commune), whose names are then enumerated; "we claim our part of the responsibility for those fires, which destroyed the instruments of royal, of bourgeois, oppression or protected our fighters."

In every revolution some follies are inevitably committed, just as they are at any other time, and when quiet is finally restored, and calm

reasoning comes, people necessarily conclude. We have done many things that had better been left undone, and we have neglected many things which we should have done, and for this reason things went wrong.

But what a lack of judgment it requires to declare the Commune sacred, to proclaim it infallible, to claim that every burnt house, every executed hostage, received their just dues to the dot over the i! Is not that equivalent to saying that during that week in May the people shot just as many opponents as was necessary and no more? Does not that repeat the saying about the First French Revolution: Every beheaded victim received justice, first those beheaded by order of Robespierre, and then Robespierre himself? To such follies are people driven when then they give free rein to the desire to appear formidable, although they are at bottom quite goodnatured.

Enough. In spite of all follies of the fugitives, and in spite of all comical efforts to appear terrible, this programme shows some progress. It is the first manifesto in which French workingmen endorse the present German Communism. And these are moreover workingmen of that calibre who consider the French as the chosen people of the revolution and Paris as the revolutionary Jerusalem. To have carried them to this point is the undeniable merit of Vaillant, who is one of the signers of the manifesto, and who is well known to be thoroughly familiar with the German language and the German Socialist literature. The German Socialist workingmen, on the other hand, who proved in 1870 that they were completely free from jingoism, may regard it as a good sign that French workingmen adopt correct theoretical principles, even when they come from Germany. (From "Der Volksstaat," No. 73, 1874. Translated by Ernest Untermann.)

"We are continually being told that we should not trade with Germany, but how are we to get our indemnities if we do not trade with her? France and America are already taking all steps to trade with Germany, and we should not be called upon to stand aside." So spake Mr. Churchill at Sunderland on Jan. 3rd.

And once again events have verified us. We said, at the time that magnificent piece of bluff the Paris Economic Conference, was staged, that it was sheer bamboozle, and now—

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

SKETCHES.

The issue of an alleged organ of patriotism—the "Daily Sketch"—for the 18th November, 1919, contains an attempt to score off a contemporary, in which the author—"The Man in the Street"—as may be expected, misrepresents the working-class position.

He says: "I want the people who 'create all wealth,' to take special note of the fact that Mr. Churchill's challenge (in the 'Illustrated Sunday Herald' of the 16th November, 1919) was couched in the following terms:

There can be no contrast more striking than that presented by the sober, solid weight and influence of British Trade Unionism and the ruthless, crazy, devastating doctrines with which it has allowed itself to be saddled. These doctrines, and the mood and feeling which support them, can clearly be seen whenever a Labour newspaper is produced. They arise from a thoroughly jaundiced outlook on things in general.

"The British Empire and all that goes to build it up is regarded as a sordid, quasi-criminal, company-promoting affair. The fighting services, in which the average working man takes so much pride, are treated as mere wastrels in themselves, and tools of ambition. The British Constitution, with its ancient traditions and all its wonderful adaptability, which have won for it the admiration, and to a large extent the imitation, of the entire world, is depicted as a base device to favour monopolies and existing vested interests.

"An internationalism of the most extravagant kind; an extreme pacifism that in the war manifested itself as an unaffected defeatism; a wholesale repudiation of national and private obligations; a frank and spontaneous adoption of the point of view of every country but their own, combined with an extraordinary levity in regard to practical and immediate consequences—these are the characteristics of Labour propaganda."

The foregoing contains more errors to the acre than any statement of similar area on record.

We are just now concerned with the second and third pars. set out above.

Winnie tells us that "the people who create all wealth" say that "the British Empire is regarded as a sordid, quasi-criminal . . . affair," etc., etc.

Well, my winsome Winny! And "The Man in the Street"—"What about it"? Isn't it true? Is this indictment in any particular inaccurate?

No. On the contrary, every word of it stands proven from the pages of history, or the teaching of modern science.

For instance, can any one study the history of India—especially the annals of the East India Co.—and the struggles between the English and the French around Pondicherry and elsewhere, purely over questions of commerce, without coming to the conclusion that the British Empire—and for that matter every other form of capitalist government—is a "sordid, quasi-criminal, company-promoting affair."

Seeing that "the fighting services" are used entirely for purposes of destruction, and never produce anything, by what process of logic can they be described as being other than "mere wastrels in themselves, and tools of (capitalist) ambition"?

As for the third par quoted above, "The Man in the Street" goes on: "The B.W.M." (the British Working Man) "can at least count up to five beans; and then asks if Churchill in the hunk of him I have quoted, put down five beans or five bits of bogey?"

"I say that he has put down five beans."

Our author goes: "I say that they are true and irrefutable beans, and that if they hadn't been true and irrefutable the 'eager' Labour newspaper would have hopped on to them like the machine-minder's labourer hopped on to the blackleg—namely, with a spanner."

Yes! my dear "Man in the Street," they are five beans—"true and irrefutable," and because they are "true and irrefutable" you are going to cop it even as the poor wretch of a blackleg copped it—with a spanner; for unlike the miserable Labour newspaper that "lies low and says nuffin," the present writer will smash your argument.

Here is the first "bean."

"An internationalism of the most extravagant kind."

The interests of the workers of every country are, in the main, the same: to sell the only commodity they possess, that is their labour-power, on the best possible terms; and any change in the conditions of labour in one country must necessarily find its reflex in other countries. Therefore the workers must organise internationally for the purpose of ending the exploitation of their class, which exploitation is the object for which the employing class buy labour-power.

The second "bean" is: "An extreme 'pacifism' that in the war manifested itself as an unaffected 'defeatism.'"

Inasmuch as Socialists strongly object to taking any part in capitalist wars, it may be correct to describe them as "pacifists," apart from this reservation, that the Socialist Party

is AT WAR—in the class war—with the capitalist class of the world.

Then we come to the third "bean": "a wholesale repudiation of national and private obligation."

Terrible indeed! As regards the first item in this truly marvellous "bean," who was it entered into these aforesaid national obligations? The fact that they are national precludes the workers from taking any part therein, for the working class is a *slave class*, and while they occupy that status cannot be a part of the nation, and therefore cannot be concerned in the fulfilment or otherwise of agreements arranged between different sections of the exploiting class.

Next, the fourth "bean": "A frank and spontaneous adoption of the point of view of every country but their own."

Now, will winsome Winnie or his docile disciple "The Man in the Street," tell us what country the workers can claim as theirs? They do everything necessary for the production of the whole of the wealth of society, but they have not a jot or tittle of ownership in either the raw material, the means of production, or the wealth when it is produced. The ownership of these things is vested entirely in the people who comprise the "nation." The workers are outcasts in the land of their birth—whatever part of the world that may be—living a mere Ishmaelish existence.

The fifth "bean" is a continuation of the fourth, as follows: ". . . combined with an extraordinary levity in regard to practical and immediate consequences—these are the characteristics of labour propaganda."

Really, this is a serious indictment of the working class! In face of these charges how can we hold up our heads and look our owners in the face?

But hold on! Our gallant (!) critics need not worry. Churchill's diatribe, and his understudy's comments thereon, do not apply to us, but to the Labour Party. And the Labour Party is quite tame and subservient to the interests and dictates of the capitalist class. It is not out to destroy capitalism, but to reform it—

"To rub off the warts and pimples,
To iron out the cracks and dimples."

Did they not allow their spokesmen to support in every possible way the ghastly outrage on mankind during the past five years?

Did not Brownlie write an infamous letter to the last T.U.C. demanding increased production? Has not the late Food Controller written in the Press to the same effect? Does not the Labour Party allow their members to take office in capitalist governments?

Any organisation which claims to be out for the emancipation of the working class must of necessity, if it is to make good its claim, be hostile—in every sense of the term—to every section of the slave-owning class, "whether avowedly capitalist or alleged labour."

It must fight, fight, fight, at every opportunity, with every available weapon that will serve its cause.

Such an organisation is the
SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.
HUTCH.

COMPARISONS.

Discharged and demobilised soldiers are starving and homeless in the country they "defended"; officers who cannot find work here are being sent abroad to cultivate the wilderness; Field Marshal Haig is appealing to employers "on behalf of the unemployed ex-officers and men, who number between 300,000 and 400,000" ("Daily News," 11.11.19); workers throughout the country are continually striking in order to try and keep up with the increasing cost of living; employment is becoming relatively scarcer, and, among the workers, the struggle to live is becoming fiercer.

Dr. Saleeby, giving evidence at the meeting of the National British Rate Commission on 7th November last stated that he estimated the cost of feeding a small baby properly to-day to be 30s. per week ("Daily News," 8.11.16). What chance has the average member of the working class of feeding his babies properly? It would take his whole wages to feed twins, according to Dr. Saleeby's estimate.

Such is the position the working class finds itself faced with twelve months after the ending of the war that was to work so many miracles.

And what of the masters?

Lord Leverhulme, Lady Rhonda, and such folk are spending millions acquiring new companies; undertaking after undertaking is combining and vast new companies are being floated, the shares being subscribed for in a twinkling of the eye—in fact, among the capitalists there is literally money to burn at the present moment. Commenting on this fact the City Editor of the "Daily News" (3.11.19) makes the following observations:

Not since the rubber boom of 1910 has such a flood of company prospectuses appeared asking for subscriptions.

Many important industries have drawn together so that for several years there has been a continuous absorption of smaller concerns by bigger neighbours.

Over and above these special considerations, it must be remembered that the higher range of prices for commodities and of values in the country, which has

accompanied the inflation of credit produced by the expenditure connected with the war, has played a great part in assisting the boom in business undertakings during the past few years. . . . Profits, represented in the new money now circulating, are much larger, while fixed charges on Debenture and Preference capitals have often remained unchanged, with the result that the divisible profits of these undertakings have been largely increased.

In the "Daily News" (10.11.19) there appears an article by their Special Commissioner on the Lancashire cotton boom, from which I take the following extracts:

Never, I suppose, in the world's industrial history has there been a parallel to the cotton boom in Lancashire to-day. It dazzles the imagination like a new goldfield. . . . Lancashire is in a position to squeeze humanity. And to be brutal, Lancashire fully intends to squeeze.

Humanity is crying out for cotton as it has never cried before. Not only its chest of drawers, but its back is bare. Africa, India, China, Australia, South America—all those populous regions where cotton goods are the chief clothing material—need cotton, after five years of short supply, with an unexampled urgency, and the demand of the colder countries is only less eager. They are willing to pay from three to four times as much as five years ago, and the quantity they are prepared to take at this price has no limit that can yet be fixed.

Further on he says the mill owners are "piling up mountainous fortunes."

In the same paper for 13.11.19 the same writer says, referring to Yorkshire:

It is hardly necessary for me to tell you that there is only one boom that approaches the Lancashire cotton boom, of which I wrote recently, and that is the Yorkshire wool boom. Indeed the manufacturers of woollen goods are, if anything, better pleased than those of cotton goods, because their supply of raw material is more certain, both as to quantity and quality. Profits in some branches of the wool trade rule, too, a good deal higher than in any section of the cotton trade.

Compare the above quotations with the following:

A case of poverty so distressing that the police officer who went to the house to make an arrest himself offered money to buy food and firing was before the Guildhall magistrate yesterday.

When Detective Bryant visited the house there was no furniture, food, fire, or light, and Mrs. Page, her husband and five children were absolutely destitute. The husband, crippled with rheumatism, had been unable to find work. ("Daily News," 21.11.19.)

Or take another example—the case of an ex-service man, demobilised last February after three years' service, out-of-work since leaving the Army in spite of "weary journeys round the labour exchanges":

The man's wife was nearly blind and partly deaf, and he had eight children, whose ages ranged from six months to 16 years. The furniture in the house, said Mr. Biner, consisted of beds, four chairs, and a table—nothing else. Ten were sleeping in one room. The

children had poor clothing and boots and were underfed, and there was no coal in the house. ("Daily News," 11.11.19.)

And they who, though "piling up mountainous fortunes," will not even care for the shattered living, insulted the memory of our deluded dead with "two minutes in which the wheels ceased to revolve while all mourned the loving dead"! Yes, a two minutes' stoppage of work cost the hypocrites comparatively nothing, but it was cold comfort for the bereaved.

The quotations relating to Lancashire and Yorkshire show what was behind the crusade for increased production. Increased production (other things remaining the same) means a cheapening of the cost of the labour-power, and consequently an increase in the already enormous profits. The propaganda for increased production illustrates to what depths of callousness our masters are prepared to sink in order to extract more surplus-value—callous of working-class misery, and oblivious of the cant in which they have lately indulged when driving the hudding manhood of the working class to the European shambles.

Yorkshire and Lancashire are standing examples, all through the last century, of the way the industrial magnates have built up their vast wealth out of the sweat and misery of working men, women, and even children. The following extracts, which have been taken from an article headed "The Decay of Lancashire," which appeared in the "Penny Magazine" for June 28, 1919, give an idea of the condition of the workers where the "boom" is on:

There are long hours of work under unhealthy conditions, the exploitation of female and child labour, and Lancashire's methods of screwing out the last ounce of production at the lowest possible price by speeding up machinery and by actual robbery of the operatives. Add to these the recurring periods of unemployment, low wages, often bad housing, and you have the explanation of the high death rate.

The work has to be carried on amidst the ceaseless roar of machinery in artificially heated and often humidified room. It is monotonous and enervating. As to its monotony, it is sufficient to point out that mechanical invention has reached such a pitch of perfection that the machine is almost human and the human is little more than a machine.

The temperature of the mill is often from 80 to 90 degrees. In such an atmosphere youths and girls are forced into maturity before their time, like plants in a hothouse. And they pay the penalty by becoming old before their time. They also pay for the contrast between the heat of the mill and the inclemency of the Lancashire climate by a great burden of sickness. They are, many of them, pallid, stunted, and narrow-chested, easy victims of consumption and bronchial affections.

It may be said that the great masses of the industrial population of Lancashire are ailing from the cradle to the grave. Nowhere do the quack doctors, the herbalists, and the venders of pills and patent

medicines reap such a rich harvest as in the cotton towns.

The leopard cannot change his spots nor the appropriator of unpaid labour his methods. The capitalist class in the early days filched from the workers the product of their labour and kept them at their toil with the whip of starvation. In its old age it spreads misery, want, and desolation among the working class to an increasing extent. The only hope for the toiler is to work for the overthrow of the system that is rooted in the servitude of the wage-worker.
GILMAC.

IF MAN FRIDAY

If Man Friday could be suddenly introduced to our industrial life, taken into the factories and shown the wonderful processes by which we pour out society's dazzling stream of wealth, have explained to him the astonishing contrivances by which we have conquered space and time and the forces of nature, what would surprise him most? Would it be the wonderful looms reeling off miles of fine cloth, or the carpet looms weaving a double fabric to be split into two as it is woven, or the railway trains flying over the land at a mile a minute, or the 50,000 horse power engines of the giant ships, or the mighty mills grinding a nation's corn, or the newspaper machines turning out their scores of thousands of papers per hour, or the airmen climbing up into the clouds, or what?

No, it would not be any of these things that would give Robinson Crusoe's intelligent batman his greatest or most lasting surprise. When he had seen all our technical marvels he would naturally ask to be shown the results, and then he would get a jolt. He would find that in spite of the prodigious wealth that could be produced, people were in want; then he would discover that, contrary to all his previous experience, people were most in want when there was most wealth in the land, and finally he would see that it was not those who did not produce the wealth that were in want, but those who did, and—the knockout—the more they produced the deeper their want. And then he would laugh!

He would laugh because he had tumbled to the secret of the whole thing. His mind would go back to the time when he lay on the beach, the prospective joint of his hungry brethren, before Robins n robbed them of their dinner. He would recognise in our productive system only another form of cannibalism. All our marvels of science and ingenuity he would recognise only as adjuncts of an elaborate scheme of cannibalism, in which men ate other men piece-meal, instead of at a sitting.

Yes, he would see men's and women's sinews being, through these wonderful instruments of labour, worn into wealth for their masters' appropriation, their flesh ground into profit for their master's pocketing; and he would marvel not so much at the development of our industrial devices as at the surprising way in which cannibalism has been elaborated through ages of development, to convert the unconscious victim of an hour's feast into sentient flesh quivering for a lifetime under wheels that pinch and peel.

A. E. J.

NOTICES OF SPECIAL MEETINGS.

MANCHESTER.

Manchester Branch have arranged a SERIES OF THREE LECTURES, to be given in the ONWARD HALL, 207 DEANSGATE, CITY, MANCHESTER. The first of these Lectures is fixed for JANUARY 20th, and the subject will be "Nationalisation." The other Lectures will be given on the 3rd and 16th of FEBRUARY respectively. The Chair will be taken at 7.30 p.m. on each occasion. All are heartily welcome, whatever his or her views, and questions will be gratefully accepted and courteously answered. This notice cancels that in our last issue.

NORTH-WEST LONDON.

Under the auspices of the N.W. London Branch TWO LECTURES will be given at JOHNSON'S ROOMS, 241 MARYLEBONE ROAD, W. (a few doors from Edgware Road Station), on the 12th and 23rd JANUARY at 8 p.m. Subject: "SOCIALISM."

Admission free. All working men and women are earnestly invited to attend.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS FOR JANUARY.

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sundays:

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7 p.m.

Mondays:

Tollington Rd., Holloway Rd. (near Nag's Head), 8.

Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 186 Vol. 16.]

LONDON, FEB., 1920.

[MONTHLY, ONE PENNY]

THE SOCIAL QUACKS

ON REVOLUTION.

In his masterly essay, "Causes of Belief in God," Paul Lafargue shows how the capitalist method of production divides society into superstitious capitalists and materialist workers. The buying and selling of stocks and

The Economic Determinant. shares are to the average capitalist a gamble. He knows little or nothing of the actual concerns. He often has friends who have

lost heavily in dealings on the Stock Exchange. He receives rude shocks occasionally through rumours affecting his own investments, and not being able to control the conditions that bring success or failure, regards the whole question as one of chance.

The worker, on the other hand, is concerned with the material processes of production and distribution. He sees in these processes nothing marvellous because they are the result of the combined efforts of his fellow workers, and he himself takes a hand. Powerful engines, and the terrific force generated by them, have no terrors for the worker, because he controls them. His share of the industrial process, wages, is not subject to chance. They do not fluctuate from a standard of exquisite luxury to one of poverty; he remains always poor, not expecting, or even dreaming of, obtaining a fancy price for his labour-power.

The Worker's Earthly Wisdom. When the prices of necessities are raised to him, he blames those who raise them. When his wages are reduced,

his hours of labour prolonged, or the speed of the machine increased against him, he does not whine that it is the will of God. Neither does he try to explain such misfortunes by economic law. To him it is a personal matter and the capitalist is the person responsible; he therefore takes organised action against him. The

worker does not look for abstruse explanations of the economic disturbances that hurt him: he blames the capitalist. But the latter, sometimes hit by the same disturbances, blames his luck and tries to ward off disaster with mascots. He

The Chance for Dinkey-Doo. believes in lucky days, fortune tellers, and spiritualist revelations. When some mad professor of physical science predicts the end of the

world because one side of the solar system seems overweighted with planets, the big luminaries of the scientific world rush into print to re-assure the wealthy idlers, who are in the main, just as void of scientific knowledge as the workers. The professors who ridiculed the idea knew they were safe in this case, because they alone would have been able to say "we told you so."

When financial or trade crises ruin many capitalists, economic and social quacks get busy explaining causes, prophesying rapid recovery, and generally offering advice and administering comfort to those who are threatened with disaster. But it is when industrial disputes develop and spread from one occupation to another, when waves of discontent surge backwards and forwards, and the structure of civilisation seems threatened, when Bolshevism is triumphant in

The Propheteers' Harvest. Russia and all middle Europe seems affected by it, then it is that the experts get busy explaining, warning, and advising their capitalist

masters. Revolution is hinted at, prophesied for the near future, already here, and utterly discredited by politicians, economists, and social reformers with equally plausible arguments.

The Prime Minister says that "a revolutionary spirit is in the air." In his usual self-ad-

vertising style he proclaims his ability to turn it. "It is simply the flood," he goes on, "the spade in the stream. What it wants is direction." Mr. Bonar Law said: "I am not afraid of the revolutionary spirit; revolution and the danger of it will come only if the social and economic conditions become intolerable." And of course they are not intolerable for these two gentlemen and the class they represent.

After them comes Mr. McCurdy, M.P., who says: "Not one man in a hundred of our strikers knows anything, or cares to know anything, about the philosophy of anarchism or syndicalism. He is looking for a way out of his own personal troubles—high prices, the irritation of profiteering, the limited share he gets of the comforts of life."

This is pleasant reading for the average capitalist, who wants to believe that the workers still lack the knowledge and intelligence necessary for combination against him on sound lines. But in his further remarks Mr. McCurdy goes far to prove that conditions are forcing the workers to become revolutionary.

"Higher wages," he says, "lead to higher prices, unless there is increased production." But, like all the advocates of greater production, he means greater production per worker, who cannot, therefore, get his better conditions, because prices will not fall until demand has contracted, which means increased unemployment and lower wages to correspond with the reduced prices.

The worker is never in a position to take advantage of the reductions in price. Whether his wages are high or low, prices always soar at a level that prevents him attaining to a comfortable standard of living. Resolutions demanding drastic government action against the "profiteer" have no effect because profiteers are capitalists just the same as other capitalists not "lucky" enough to be profiteers, but hoping to be so shortly. The workers are baffled whatever action they take along the lines they have so far been accustomed to follow. But Socialism is at their elbows—will they pause and examine it?

Another mistake that Mr. McCurdy makes is in thinking that Syndicalism or Anarchism are really dangers to the stability of capitalist society. Their real danger is to the working class, which, in so far as it heeds these things, neglects the obvious course of gaining control of the political machine, and lays itself open to militant suppression by the Government—a form of suppression the ruling class have proved themselves only too ready to adopt, many of them, without doubt, considering it necessary that society should be periodically purged of its revolutionary elements. And what more favour-

able opportunity could present itself than large numbers of workers imbued with the belief that they can carry through the Revolution by means of strikes or looting, or by physical force?

It was this belief on the part of the Parisian workers that gave Theirs and the French capitalists the opportunity to massacre the communards; and that massacre will no doubt be repeated on a more colossal scale in Russia unless the Bolshevik leaders are wise enough to effect a compromise before the full weight of surrounding capitalist forces is hurled against them and their premature revolution.

The economist is an adjunct of the political party and manufactures arguments, principles, and even economic "laws" according to the needs of his party. When he speaks of revolution as the outcome of present working-class discontent he refers to it as a convulsion of society, with nothing to follow but brutal dictatorships or universal chaos. It would not suit capitalist ideas and interests to even admit the possibility of an alternative system of society. Capitalism, in the opinion of capitalists, is the highest expression of social organisation. Consequently the Russian movement and the general unrest, if it means revolution, is the beginning of the end: the annihilation of the human race through the absence of law and order.

In the "Review of Reviews" (Aug. 1919) Mr. J. A. Hobson says that the "scientific Socialist hails this intestinal warfare with a sombre satisfaction as the fulfilment of his law of economic determination." It is far easier to hazard sneering guesses about the emotions of Socialist opponents than it is to pulverise the "law of economic determination," though it matters nothing what the Socialist, or even Hobson, feels about it, if it is a law. Grudgingly he admits that the Socialist is right when he says that the development of capitalist society means the growing antagonism of the working class towards capitalism and all those who seek to maintain it. But his admission matters very little; the fact remains that "human society is out of harmony with its surroundings and must re-adapt itself in order to continue its existence." But to re-adapt itself means, not superficial, but fundamental changes, and Socialism alone contains such fundamental changes.

Mr. Hobson concedes to the Socialist the correctness of his diagnosis, and, therefore, admits the inevitability of the class war. But he asks, "need we succumb to this terrible philosophy? I think not." And then he tries to comfort his friends the capitalists by assuring them that "the vast majority of the workers

mistrusts all conscious formulation of aims and policy except for short range and concrete objects." These "concrete objects" are, a voice in workshop control, security of tenure, a reasonable standard of comfort and leisure."

But capitalism has always refused these to the workers, except in rare instances when labour-power has been in great demand. Wages must be kept down while industry is carried on for profits, consequently there must be an unemployed army which imposes on the workers the competitive struggle for jobs, and a "reasonable standard of comfort and leisure" is an impossibility under the system for all those who sell their energy for wages.

Then Mr. Hobson shows how "short range" are capitalist "politics and economics." He is confident "that the great mass of the workers would accept these substantial gains and would not clamour for the destruction of the wage system." But he realises that "no present settlement on these, or any, lines would have permanency"—another admission that must give "sombre satisfaction to the scientific Socialist."

Politicians and economists alike, with all their efforts to bring comfort and assurance to their friends the capitalists, cannot conceal the pessimism they feel. They rack their brains for rough and ready arguments that will deceive the workers and bolster up a rotten system, carrying it on from day to day. They declare that revolutionary Socialists are small in number, and that the mass of the workers are not affected. They indulge in cheap sneers at the founders of modern Socialism, and denounce the workers as the enemies of society when, driven by actual want, they strike for some slight improvement in their conditions. But they cannot explain, scientifically, the growing universal antagonism of the workers towards the ruling class.

There is an element of uncertainty about the growth of the Socialist movement. Not even the Socialist can tell how far the minds of the workers are turned to receive the principles of Socialism, or how many, already understanding them, are only waiting a popular movement basis on Socialism. The working-class mind, trained to materialism in industry, quite easily grasps the principles of Socialism when clearly presented. The avowed numbers to-day may be small, but it is the soundness of the principles, and the ease with which they can be understood, and the growing realisation by the workers that their accustomed methods achieve nothing, that is driving them to Socialism. The capitalists' fear of the future is a convincing answer upon this point, while no Socialist has any doubt as to the future.

F. F.

BY THE WAY.

The master class and their satellites never weary in their campaign of extolling the "virtues" of practising thrift, increasing production, and diminishing consumption on the part of the workers.

That these things are the inevitable lot of working-class existence, and consequently the majority could not partake of the schemes for saving, even if they would, never seems to dawn upon those engaged in boosting appeals, so far are they removed from the actual facts of life.

On the other hand, while we are engaged in these slavish practices from economic compulsion, our bosses are enjoying themselves at "Victory Balls" or skiing at some Swiss resort.

Only a few days ago the National Savings Assembly held a meeting in London, and on this occasion a message from the King was read, from which I cull the following:

It will be your endeavour to explain and to encourage the reduction of unnecessary consumption, and the increase of production, in order that the whole national standard of living may be improved. . . . I am to express the King's hope that both employers and employed will lend their support to increase the number of Savings Associations in the works and factories throughout the realm.

—"Daily News," January 17th, 1920.

One of the promoters of the movement, Sir Robert Kindersley, speaking at this meeting admitted the poverty position of the workers, though, of course, quite accidentally, when he said "there were still literally tens of thousands of factories and works throughout the country without a War Savings Association."

How the "national standard of living is to be improved" we are never told, though the phrase is an oft-recurring one. Of course, during the early days of the war, when various bodies of workers were discussing with Lloyd George the questions of dilution, speeding-up of munitions, and so forth, he then suggested that this matter of a "higher standard" should be deferred until the war with Germany was concluded, and it was about this period that we were treated to the Lloyd Georgian slogan—"Audacity Wins." However, it is demonstrably clear it was merely words, words, words.

That such a state of things is seriously contemplated is untrue, and can be easily proven, for even in the Government's wages agreement with the railwaymen provision is made for a reduction of one shilling for every 5 points fall in the cost of living. This, then, is the way not to improve the standard of living.

To those who are continually shouting about the wave of working-class prosperity brought about as the result of the war a study of the conditions under which the workers live, move, and have their being would, indeed, be an eye-opener. In spite of the "fabulous" sums which we receive as wages at the end of the week, we, unlike the members of the idle, parasitic class, are unable to take ourselves to Monte Carlo and other fashionable resorts. No, these "high wages" merely suffice to keep us going just about another week, so with clockwork regularity we present ourselves at the busses' warehouses and factory gates in order to obtain the wherewithal to exist.

While our masters may gamble at Monte Carlo and elsewhere, we, the working class, are told by some who should know a little about these matters that we are too poor to have a flutter on premium bonds.

In this connection I would quote the following comment on premium bonds which recently appeared in the Monthly Review of the London Joint City and Midland Bank:

It must not be forgotten that, great as have been the wage-increases of the community, they have, taken as a whole, barely kept pace with the still rising cost of living, and certainly do not yield a large margin for investment such as the advocates of Premium Bonds believe to be possible.

So once again is our diagnosis of the working-class position confirmed even by the "enemy" himself.

In the far-off days before the war, Mr. Lloyd George (speaking of the "boon" he was conferring upon those veterans of industry who had been so busily engaged in creating wealth for others to enjoy that at the age of three score years and ten they found the only haven of refuge was the workhouse, delivered himself of the following concerning old-age pensions:

By this act of justice we have sweetened the bitterest thoughts of the poor and lightened the darkest hours of their existence. That which they most dreaded—old age—is now an anticipation of honourable ease. The workhouse has become the chimney-corner. The spectre has become an angel.

Beautiful swank! We said at the time that it was mere humbug—a capitalist rate-saving device.

Having given the picture as portrayed by the author, let me give the facts as recited (one account of many) in that organ of Liberalism and Lloyd George, "Reynolds's Newspaper," (December 31st, 1919).

The pathetic details of the death of two aged sisters who starved in a city of wealth and plenty were related at the inquest at Liverpool on Mary Gray aged 81, widow, and Ann Coyne, aged 74, spinster.

The women were found lying dead on the floor of

their kitchen, and it was stated that they existed on their old age pensions and 7s. subscribed fortnightly by friends. There was no bed. Mary, who was blind, slept on an old armchair. A piece of dried crust was the only food in the house.

A doctor gave evidence that their clothing was simply rags. Ann evidently had fallen over a tattered rug and lain helpless through weakness, dying of concussion of the brain. Mary died more recently, and had sat in a chair for a day or two without anything to eat. Both were very emaciated.

The Coroner said it was a horrible thing that in a city like Liverpool these poor old women had died in this manner.—"Reynolds's," Dec. 21st, 1919.

I can just imagine how these old ladies' "darkest hours were lightened" by the possession of such unbounded Christian generosity in the shape of 15 whole shillings per week. In similar circumstances I would far rather have the "workhouse" than the "chimney corner."

Fellow worker, have you ever thought what your support of capitalist society means to you and your class? It means a life of toil and poverty, and at the end of the journey, when you are no longer useful as a profit-producing machine, the workhouse stares you in the face, or if you should reach the prescribed term of years a grateful country may allow you 10s. a week to commit suicide with. Is it worth fighting for? Think it over. If you desire something better, then come and join us and help to win the World for the Workers.

At the time when the results of the Borough Council Elections were made known in November last there was much joy and jubilation because it had come to pass that Labour had captured many seats on the various councils throughout the country. After all, there is little cause for rejoicing, for Capitalism has won again. There is, indeed, much hard spade work yet to be done. It is Tweedledum and Tweedledee. True, according to the various "programmes" of the Labour Party which I have seen, they are going to try and make capitalism more bearable. The feeding of school children and the supply of milk to necessitous mothers, free libraries and mixed bathing for the unemployed advocated by them, have for long years formed part of the "progressive" ticket.

The fact that in society to-day there exists underfed school children and necessitous mothers is part of the indictment against capitalism and a strong reason for revolutionary action and not reform. Tinkering with the effects of the system is of no avail. The cause of poverty in the midst of plenty is to be found in the private ownership of the means of life. Social ownership can alone effect the change. And this the Labour Party does not stand for.

During the war period case after case could be cited to show that the Labour men were nothing but capitalist hacks. To all students of politics a whole host of names will readily suggest itself. Coming to a more recent date we have the notorious case of Manchester's Lord Mayor, which is worth recording:

Manchester's Labour Lord Mayor, Alderman Tom Fox, uttered a stern warning to a deputation of unemployed on Saturday.

Vague threats of violence in the event of work not being forthcoming have been made. Such procedure was roundly condemned by Alderman Fox. "Thirty years ago," he frankly said, "I was one of you, using the same sort of talk, but it leads nowhere!"

It is time all this nonsense was knocked on the head.

Suppose anything of this happened, then you would come up against authority, and that authority in this city is vested in myself for the time being, as well as in the police force.

Then you are up against the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—all in their full strength. There are a few of you. I know what would happen, and it is as well that you knew too.

There would be an appeal to the Lord Mayor for order, and I am prepared to take action with all the energy I am capable of, and don't you forget it, my friends. I am the Lord Mayor, and I am bound to keep order, and as the Lord Mayor I would do it. Don't make any mistake about it.

—"Daily News," Dec. 1st, 1919.

So there you have it "naked and unashamed." I, the representative of King Capital, will use all the forces of capitalism against you, the workers, if and when necessary. What think ye now, ye workers who voted Labour not understanding that Labourism is but another name for Capitalism?

A meeting was held in December last at the Mansion House for the purpose of laying the foundation of a movement for linking together in active co-operation all bodies and organisations—religious, social, or industrial—which are striving to break down the barriers between class and class and to establish relations of mutual confidence between employers and employed. Notwithstanding the efforts of these enterprising people, I feel bound to add that they have a big job on hand.

Judging from the weighty words of wisdom which fell from the lips of the Bishop of Peterborough, we have great cause for thankfulness, my brethren, that our erring Christian friend has at last grasped a sublime truth. He said: "Industry was made for man and not man for industry. We have had too much of the soul-destroying competition of the past." Verily, we move.

Another gentleman of the cloth, the Rev. Father Plater, who evidently knew his fellow religionists well, stated that: "Religion was not

praying into a top hat on Sunday morning with liberty to prey upon our neighbours the rest of the week." ("Daily News," December 10th, 1919.)

Why, oh why, my masters, is it now necessary, seeing that the world has been made safe for democracy, to form associations to "break down the barriers between class and class"? With wearying monotony throughout the last four years you have time and again told us that the war had accomplished this thing for you, and that the unity formed in the trenches would stand you in good stead in the days ahead.

No, sirs, you have been cherishing a delusion. It cannot be done. Look around you on every hand and you will see signs that there is an antagonism of interest between the two sections in the community—a class war—which can only be terminated by the abolition of classes in and through the institution of the Socialist Commonwealth.

THE SCOUT.

"ACCUMULATED EXPERIENCES."

In the early days of the war, when all kinds of devices were being used to induce young men to enlist in the Army, Mr. Lloyd George used his famous rhetoric to assist the cause of his employers. We called attention at the time to many of his remarks in speeches urging young men of our class to join their comrades in eternity, but it may not be out of place here to recall some of his statements—just to keep their memory green!

When speaking in Wales on the 29th Sept., 1914, at a national Welsh Conference for the purpose of assisting in the formation of a Welsh Army Corps, he made the following remarks:

The vast majority return from a war to tell the tale and they will have accumulated experiences which will illumine their lives for ever after. Most people's lives are dull, grey, and monotonous, and these men will come back with a fund of recollection to draw upon which should cheer and brighten their lives at the dreariest moment. . . . I am glad that the War Office are recognising the value of this national sentiment as a military asset.

—"Manchester Guardian," 30.9.14.

We now have plenty of evidence of the "joys" those returned from the war have accumulated. Ask any of the returned soldiers how they would like to go through their war horrors again! And what was the nature of these experiences? They saw the heads of their chums blown off while standing beside them; their friends disembowelled by murderous iron splinters. They experienced the horrors of battle, with the nerve strain and tension of going "over the top,"

the verminous sleeping places, the months of wallowing in mud and water to the hips in the depth of winter, the lack of food and the ravages of disease, the lying, perhaps for days, stricken things on the shell-swept field, the ever-present spectre of Death.

Many have lost their reason on account of the experiences they have gone through. Many more have been converted into permanent wrecks. Many of those who returned home found homes that had been wrecked by their thankless rulers in their absence.

What a fund of recollections to brighten their lives at the dreariest moment!

The "vast majority" who were to return turned out to be a rather small "vast majority." According to the latest figures (and we may be sure it is an under-estimation), nearly a million British soldiers were killed, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands totally or partially disabled for life. A walk through the streets of any town will provide the observer with numerous illustrations of the havoc wrought by the war that, according to Lloyd George, was to accumulate experiences that would illumine lives for ever after. The blinded or limbless soldier can have little but bitterness in his heart for the rest of his life.

In spite of all the cant and humbug of early war days the war veteran has returned to working conditions even worse than obtained formerly. While the papers are prating about "booms" in the cotton, woollen, boot and shoe, and other industries, and labour leaders are urging workers to greater efforts in production, ex-soldiers are scouring the country in vain for the elusive job.

Earl Haig (who is not one of them) has been appealing to employers all over the country on behalf of the thousands of ex-soldiers unemployed. Speaking at Leeds the other day he made following remarks:

It was impossible to suggest that the nation's debt had been discharged while men who had fought in the desperate battles at Cambrai, Ypres, and Arras were seeking employment and finding none. They were asking some small share in the prosperity which their efforts had made possible.—"Daily News," 24.1.1920.

The callous indifference to the claims of the soldiers shows once again the hollowness and fraudulent nature of capitalist promises. The general attitude of the masters was fittingly illustrated by the remarks of Judge Cluer last year in a case where an ex-soldier (five years in the Army and thrice wounded), his wife, and three children were evicted from their home and forced into the workhouse. The following quotation was taken from the "Daily Chronicle," 16.7.19.

The Solicitor: But this is the case of a hero and his family. He has sacrificed everything for his country. To be turned into the street to go into the workhouse is a scandal. He is entitled to special consideration.

Judge Cluer: He is entitled to the same consideration as anybody else. The reasons given for wanting possession are good.

At the present moment a wail is going up about a wave of "robbery with violence" that is sweeping the country. Referring to this Sir Robert Wallace (Chairman of the London Sessions) said:

It is sad to see the enormous number of men in Khaki, or recently demobilised, in the dock, but there was a carelessness about property in campaign life. Habits which we may call military but not wicked have unfortunately transplanted themselves into civil life, and this won't do.—"Daily Sketch," 22.1.1920.

Aha! there is an awkward side to war experiences for the capitalists; the "accumulated experiences" are apt to lead to capitalist discomfort. The violation of working-class lives is a detail, but heaven forbid that private property should be violated—in civil life.

Numberless are the cases of returned soldiers evicted from their homes. The pensions to the disabled and the bereaved are an insult to the memory of the living and the dead, and a crushing illustration of the parsimony and cold-blooded selfishness of the worst slave-owners known to history. Out of the many instances that spring to the writer's memory the following will suffice for illustration:

The pathetic circumstances of a soldier's widow, with nine children, who had to apply for out relief in consequence of a refusal by the Ministry of Pensions to allow her more than 6s. 10d. a week was strongly commented on at the East Preston (Sussex) Guardians yesterday.—"Daily News," 3.9.19.

To such a state as this has the "national sentiment as a military asset" brought numbers of our fellow workers. How some of us must love Lloyd George and his tribe may easily be imagined!

As to the "accumulated experiences which will illumine their lives forever after," the following extracts will provide a perfectly fitting commentary:

Reverting to influences which might help crime, the commissioner (Sir Nevil Macready) said men had taken life lightly and been encouraged to do so. It could not be expected that every individual would get back to a normal state of mind immediately.

—"Daily News," 24.1.20.

The same paper, same date, referring to a meeting of Birmingham magistrates to discuss after-the-war crime, stated:

It is largely a post-war problem. The experiences which men have gone through in the last five years have left a mental disturbance that has led to wrongdoing.

The experiences of the war wrecked many a working-class home, and the experiences of "peace" are extending the havoc further. It is small wonder that those who have been taught for years to spread ruin and destruction everywhere, whose lives were held cheap and who were brought to hold the lives of others equally cheap, should carry these ideas into civil life. The thorn in the side of our rulers is, however, that they are being to some extent hoist with their own petard. Working men were strenuously urged to ruin and destroy during the war, and consequently they have a tendency to ignore the glorious and eternal rights of private property now that they have returned to their ordinary occupation of producing wealth for idlers to enjoy.

However, Lloyd George was somewhere near the mark. Working men have "accumulated experiences" during the war which, along with other experiences which will help them to an understanding of their wage-slave position, and in due course they will take measures to ensure a cheering and brightening of their lives by abolishing capitalism and introducing Socialism from the ruins. GILMAC.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF SOCIALIST THEORY.

(Continued.)

The example of the difference of the relations between men getting their livelihood by means of simple instruments of labour (typified by the threshing flail) and those producing their sustenance by means of more advanced means of production (typified by the threshing machine) which we have given by no means exhausts the field. Just as the social structure consists of much more than these primary and personal relations, so much more in the social life takes shape from the character of the instruments of labour and the methods in which they are used. Man stands not only in relations with his fellow men, but also with the world about him, and as far as these relations are within society they have their base in the conditions of wealth production.

In the classic age of the flail, for instance, the general means of producing wealth were about on a par with that implement. It was the day of the windmill, the spinning wheel and distaff, and the primitive loom. In the towns the smith's hammer rang out, without a rival in the production of ferrous ware. Everywhere was handwork, everywhere tools. Machinery, if not unknown, was of so little importance as to have practically no influence upon the method of production.

In such conditions as this what was the relation of men toward the world? We have already seen that the instruments of labour in general belonged to those who operated them. Among the artisans of the towns, possibly, were many exceptions, but the lower we descend in the scale of the development of the instruments of labour, the more do we find the energies of the workers occupied in the production of the primary necessities, food, shelter, and clothing. Therefore, in the period of which we are speaking, the production of these things were the predominating industries, and it was the general conditions prevailing in these industries which determined the general social relations.

It was not, therefore, the handicraft of the towns which determined the social form, but the economic conditions of rural industries.

Ignoring, then, the seeming contradictions of the towns, where goods were certainly produced for sale, let us turn to the countryside.

The worker of the Middle Ages, owning the simple means by which he produced his living, had an outlook upon the world entirely different from that of the modern worker. This difference commenced with his relation to the product of his toil. His very object was different when he took his instruments of labour in hand. The modern worker starts out to produce wealth which shall be the property of the owner of the implements he operates, but the feudal worker, owning the tools with which he worked, laboured to produce wealth for himself. Hence while the modern worker realises that his function in life, and therefore the reason he is permitted to live, is to work, the mediæval worker could not take this view of himself and his relation to the world.

He worked to live. The product of his labour was a different thing at the moment of its production, from the product of the toil of his present-day prototype. The latter, producing wealth which, on production, belongs to someone else, necessarily produces what that other requires, and he cannot escape the conviction that he is only permitted to work (and therefore to live) in order to produce it. The feudal worker, on the other hand, producing wealth for himself, produced those things which he required to satisfy his own needs, hence he saw himself only working to live, and took an opposite view of his place in the world to that of the wage worker of our present system.

A. E. J.

(To be Continued.)

YOUR "STANDARD" WILL COST YOU MORE.

Commencing with the March issue the price of the SOCIALIST STANDARD will be 2d. per copy.

this machinery . . . may be converted . . . into the agent of emancipation . . .

This is the Socialist policy in a nutshell.

In the first place the workers are accustomed to organising for defence. Trade unions to-day comprise something like a quarter of the adult population. In fact, the amount of organisation existing is worthy of a better cause. We suggest that a change in tactics from mere defence (varied by surrender on important occasions) to a vigorous attack is necessary. And the proper place to deliver an attack is against the enemy's weakest spot—the ballot box. It is not enough to strike—the bosses can sack you and starve you! It is not WAR to start a little street-corner insurrection, in which only the workers' blood is shed and a capitalist can only get hurt by accident! These, of all policies, are the least practicable.

But

SEIZE THE POLITICAL MACHINE!

That is the source of the masters' strength. And it is to control *that* for which they most need your support! It is for *that* they tell you all kinds of lies, make all kinds of false promises, and employ the most cunning scoundrels the country holds. Don't be deceived by the fact that a vote is simply a piece of paper. So is a bank note or a police summons! But behind the paper is the power! Capitalists are practical men; they don't ask you to vote for fun. They know that when the workers cease to vote for them and send to Parliament, instead, the representatives of a revolutionary class, the game will be up. It will be the turn of the "respectable people" to turn rebel—if they have the guts. The worst they are likely to achieve, however, is to bribe a few fools to do their dirty work for them; but the machinery of government *includes* the armed forces of the nation. The workers supply the guns and all the equipment of the fighting forces, in addition to the personnel of the rank and file. All that is necessary, therefore, to control these forces is the organisation of the workers themselves

AS A CLASS

for that purpose. Is there anything impossible in that?

This organisation once established can only have one object, *i.e.*, to abolish the monopoly of the wealth taken from the workers by the masters. It will convert into common property the means of production, *e.*, land, factories, railways, etc., and thus impose upon everyone the necessity of work and the freedom of all to enjoy the fruits of their common labour. No one will be able to live on rent, interest, or dividends, a life of idleness. None, on the other hand, who are willing to work, will stagnate in

the half-starved ranks of the unemployed. The organisation of the workers will proceed to control industry. Again we challenge contradiction when we assert that this is the *only* practical solution of the workers' problems—

The various parties of the master class—Tories, Unionists, Radicals, etc., have long ago established their privileges, and now spend their time in retaining them. This they do by interesting the workers in every piece of legislation, etc., which they, the masters, from time to time consider necessary. Taxes on imports, taxes on land, taxes on incomes, more efficient State control of this, that or the other; all these measures are dressed up

IN THE GUISE OF REFORMS

for the benefit of the workers in order to gull them into voting their masters into power. In opposition (so called) to these parties stands the alleged Labour Party (or hotch-potch of parties) which differs from them only in the fact that its programme of "reforms" is more "advanced"—that is to say, it is calculated to more thoroughly organise capitalism and deceive the workers. None of the Labour Party's proposals differ in this from the Single Tax and other "progressive" nostrums! Every measure proposed by non-Socialist parties reveals, when closely analysed, some other attempt on the part of some section of the masters to increase or protect their revenue in some way. In no case will it be found that the workers benefit in any way. Parties are the expression of interests. The "practical politician" will be hard put to it to dispute this. Turn for yourselves to history and see for example how the landed Conservatives struggled against the rising manufacturing Liberals. Where is the party of the workers?

It can only be a party which

FIGHTS THE MASTERS!

It cannot be a party which, like the "Labour" Party, joined the Coalition of Capital when it saw jobs given away and only left it to get into a position to bargain for more! This sort of thing may be "practical" for job-hunters: it is of no use to revolutionary workers. The Socialist Party, therefore, wages war on all other parties, and calls upon the workers of this country to muster under its banner. E. B.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

AN ASPECT OF SOCIALISM.

The aim of the Socialist Party is to make Socialists! That is a truism so obvious that it would seem that only a platitudinarian would think it worth his while to repeat it. But the fact is that this truism—perhaps because it is so obvious—is sometimes lost sight of by many whose theory and practice of the principles of Socialism are beyond dispute.

Socialism has two aspects, one of which may be called the "present," and the other the "future" aspect, and because of the presence of these two aspects, a certain amount of confusion often occurs.

The "present" aspect of Socialism may be defined as those activities, exercised by the men and women who have realised their position as wage-slaves, and who have, therefore, a desire for a system of society wherein they shall be economically free, which have for their object the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of the Socialist Commonwealth. The "future" aspect of Socialism comprises all the manifold activities which will be possible when the new social system—Socialism—has been established.

Many Socialists forget, if they have ever known, that Socialism is not an end in itself, but the means to a fuller and more richly endowed way of life. No manifestation of life, whether it be economic or political, artistic or philosophical, is or can be an end in itself. Life moves on to a higher or lower plane, aided or hindered, as the case may be, by the activities of its agents, who, in their turn, are acted upon, and react upon, the eternal and unrelenting forces of nature.

The aim of the Socialist Party is to make Socialists! How, then, shall we, who have torn the veil of illusion from our modern social system and seen the naked body of Capitalism in all its hideous deformity, use our knowledge to bring to our way of thinking the men and women of the working class, without whose assistance our ultimate object is unattainable? We must show that capitalism has outlasted its usefulness; must emphasise and criticise the evils which are now the inevitable consequence of its continuance; we must point out that capitalism as a social force has played its part and that the time is ripe for the next stage in the evolution of society to be born.

Capitalism is in its death-throes, but its time in dying will be determined by the efforts of the working class as a whole to hasten its demise. Even the question as to whether or not the death-night of Capitalism will herald the dawn of the Socialist Commonwealth depends

upon the growth of the political and economic intelligence of the workers.

The first aspect of Socialism, the "present" aspect, is more applicable to actual members of the Socialist Party. This can, therefore, be left for the time being. The writer will, perhaps, revert to it in a future article.

The second aspect, the "future" aspect, is particularly important with regard to the making of Socialists. Many people, while sympathetic to the idea of Socialism, hesitate to join up with the Socialist Party because they are unable to visualise what conditions of life, other than the material, will obtain when the old system of Capitalism has passed and the new system of Socialism has taken its place. Many people consider, for instance, that under a system where the necessities and comforts of life are assured to everyone, society will lapse into a state of apathy and negligence. They cannot understand that, where people work for use and not for profit, the better the work done by the individual, the greater the benefit bestowed upon the society of which the better worker is a unit. The workers under the Socialist regime will work for themselves as a collective body and not, as now, for a comparatively few social parasites, who by reason of their class position as capitalists as against the workers' position as wage-slaves, hold in their hands the power of dealing with the very lives of the majority of the community, not as they will, but as the fluctuations of economic circumstance may force them to.

Again, many sympathisers with Socialism and Socialists, who have a smattering of artistic knowledge and appreciation—in most cases only a very minute smattering—is possible to a member of the working class—seem obsessed with the idea that the advent of Socialism would mean the cessation of all artistic activities. Actually, the advent of Socialism would have the opposite effect. At present the working-class boy who happens to show any aptitude for literature or art very soon learns that such things are not for him. He learns that they are the prerogative of those people whom he is taught to consider as his "betters." Without help or encouragement, any desire he may have to become a writer or a composer quickly dies of inanition—before it has even had time to try its wings. Moreover, when it is considered that, generally speaking, a long and costly training is necessary in order to develop the literary and artistic faculties, it can be seen how improbable it is for a boy, say of 14 years or younger, who is compelled on leaving school to find work as an errand- or office-boy, or in some suchlike inane and enervating capacity, ever to know the joy of creating a great work in the realm of

literature or art. He is soon too busy trying to discover how to earn a few more shillings a week to trouble himself about such unremunerative things as books, or painting, or musical notation.

Under Socialism, which we who are Socialists conceive as an intelligent and ordered system of society, the youthful mind would be encouraged to develop along the lines most in accordance with its particular receptivity. There would be no need for the youth of either sex to stampede, immediately on leaving school, to the factory or office door. They would have advantages similar to those now enjoyed by the children of the wealthy class, and it is not too much to say, I think, keeping in mind our knowledge of the modern university and college product, that the children of the working class would far outstrip, in the way of science, art and literature, the individuals who now leave their universities and colleges, in the majority of cases; with little else to show for their training than an "Oxford accent" and an unbounded conceit.

Socialism would mean the opening to the youth of the working class of a world undreamt of by them at present. To those members of the working class who cavil at Socialism because they fear that the downfall of Capitalism would mean the downfall of what they consider "art" and "literature," I would ask, "What are art and literature to you? What really do you know or care about the great artistic products of the world? You have neither the time, nor the inclination, nor the means, to make a study of such things. Your business is to work in order to get the wherewithal to live. Leave such things to your masters, so long as you are content to have masters."

Even if the destruction of Capitalism meant the destruction of all known art and literature, what then? If the men and women of the working class are incapable of building a more lofty tower of art than any that has yet been erected, they are not worthy to occupy the somewhat stunted edifice which by much toil and suffering has grown to what it is. The writer, however, is confident that, given the opportunity that Socialism would give to every member of the community, art and science would advance in an irresistible fashion far beyond anything yet known. Men, take them all an all, do not desire to rise superior in their activities to the activities manifested by the men preceding them.

One word more to those who, although themselves members of the working class, have such a poor opinion of the potentialities of their fellows. Why not change your tactics? Why not employ the powers you possess in helping

to found a state of affairs wherein the members of the working class—your own class—shall have a chance of showing what they can do? Understand Socialism. Organise for Socialism. Propagate Socialism. Work for Socialism. Do not worry so much about the future. The future, you may be assured, will be quite safe in the hands of an intelligent democracy. We ask for the co-operation of all who accept the principles of Socialism, so that when the inevitable disintegration of Capitalism takes place, we, the workers as a whole, shall be ready, equipped for any emergency, to enter into the new world to be won.

F. J. WEBB.

ON ABSTRACTIONS.

The majority of us when children at school were told that fable, wrongly attributed to Aesop, relating to the tragedy (from the principal character's point of view) of the dog who dropped, when crossing a stream, the bone he was carrying in order to snatch at the one he saw mirrored in the water. The moral our teachers impressed upon us was that we should not forsake the substance for the shadow.

Yet, curious paradox, we find upon looking around to-day that it is mainly because of the workers' disregard for the lesson of the fable that Capitalism has not yet fallen. True, the analogy is not quite good, since the working class have not yet held the material bone in their mouth, but though we show how near their grasp it is, they still pursue shadows, placing their trust in specious promises, which rarely materialise, and bring them no relief when they do.

I have seen men pale and wan with hunger and deprivation fling their ragged caps in the air and cheer a royalty riding by, because they believed that to worship a royal fetish and to suffer the pangs of hunger were quite the usual things to do. And therein lies the whole kernel of working-class misery.

A few years back workers in their millions sprang forth at the first call of the capitalist class to go and fight the workers of another nation. Yet in his heart of hearts scarcely a man of them, if he dared to ask himself, would have said he had a home worth fighting for or a possession to defend. But because of something which he knows by the name of "Patriotism," but which he cannot truthfully define, he donned khaki or field-grey and learned to slaughter his fellows without thinking or troubling to understand the why and the wherefore.

One will often hear a workman prate of his English nationality and consequent "freedom."

A curious definition of his freedom, however, impressed itself upon me as I was passing a place where building was in progress. It was after dark, and I saw a long line of human figures pressing against a barrier of wood which separated the area being built upon from the street. I was quite at a loss to account for them and lingered a moment to ascertain, when all at once from somewhere in the rear a shrill whistle blew, and the men, leaping the barrier (that is, the more active among them) dispersed in all directions as quickly as they could. And then I understood! These "freemen," although it had for some time been too dark to continue to work were forced to remain imprisoned behind a frail barrier until released by the blast of a whistle! It struck me then that humiliation and freedom are synonymous.

But, of course, the men themselves would not have seen the irony of the situation, in fact, if one had suggested to them that a wooden whistle is the measure of their freedom, and that their boasted liberty is a delusion, abuse, and possibly violence, would have been hurled at him.

Another pet abstraction of the occidental proletariat, particularly of this country, is "Democracy." With pride in his voice and dilated chest the average man will tell you that "this is a democratic country," and, what is more tragic, will believe it, too! But when you point out to him that under autocracies the working class are robbed, and that, be a country nominally ruled by a king, shah, kaiser, or president, poverty and hardship is the lot of the working class all the world over, he will go on worshipping some other abstract fetish rather than come down to the solid facts of his slave position and hopeless outlook under the present system.

The poor old dog will not grip the solid bone of class-consciousness, and the capitalist class know this, hence gods, kings, presidents, motherlands, liberty, patriotism, are all used in turn to satiate the proletarian appetite for abstractions rather than material welfare.

But the Socialist does not despair. He knows that all these things will fail the capitalists in the end, and that his false gods and clay-footed idols will come tumbling about his ears when the slow-witted dog "Proletariat" has learned his lesson and safely crossed the stream to enjoy that which has been denied him so long.

S. H. S.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.

By FREDERICK ENGELS.

Translated for "The Proletarian" by Prof. J. I. Cheskie, of the University of Michigan.

[The letter printed below is interesting to students of Socialism as one of the instances that show how false is the charge of the superior persons of the Labour Party and the I.L.P., of the "dogmatism" of Marx and Engels. It should also be remembered that a fight was being waged at the time the letter was written between the followers of Marx and the Anarchists of Germany, in which the latter were attempting to stretch some of the phrases of Marx and Engels on the Class War into a support of street fighting and barricades as the essential method of working-class emancipation. Similar tales are sometimes told in this country, and it is a significant fact that every new translation of Marx's and Engels' writings shows still further the falsity of these tales, and how all through their propaganda it was the capture of political power they insisted upon, as the essential that the working class must rely upon for their escape [from slavery.—Ed. Com., "S.S."]

In the course of a discussion that followed a public lecture, given at a seminary, a student asked Engels to give him precise explanations of the two following points:

1. To what extent do economic conditions act as a causative influence?
2. What part is played by the race and by the individual according to the "historical materialism" of Marx and Engels?

Engels replied:

London, Jan. 25, 1895.

122 Regents Park Road, N.W.

Dear Sir,—Following is the reply to your two questions:

1. The economic conditions, which we consider as the determinative basis in the history of society, we understand to be the manner in which men in a given society produce their means of subsistence and the ways in which they effect the exchange of products among themselves (this as long as division of labour exists). The entire technique of production and transportation is here included. According to our conception this technique determines the mode of exchange, of distribution of products, and—after the disintegration of the tribal system—the division of society into classes, the conditions of master and slave, of State, of politics, law, etc. Further, among the economic

conditions under which these phenomena obtain, must be included the geographical environment, and also the actual remains of former phases of economic evolution which often persisted by force of tradition, inertia, or because of circumstances which surrounds that form of society.

Even if, as you say, technique largely depends on the conditions of science, yet, in a greater measure, does the latter depend on the *conditions of and the need for technique*. If society is in the need of the development of a certain technique, this helps science more than ten universities. The science of hydrostatics was the sole result of the need that Italy felt in the 16th and 17th centuries of controlling the course of her torrents in the mountains. We began to understand the science of electricity only when we discovered its practical application. In Germany, however, they have become accustomed to treat the history of science as though it had fallen out of the sky.

2. We hold, that in the final analysis, economic conditions constitute the determinative factor in historical evolution. Here, therefore, we must hold in view two points:

(A). That the political, juridical, philosophical, religious, literary, artistic, etc. evolutions are based on the economic evolution. They all re-act upon each other and upon the economic basis. It does not mean that the economic factor is the *sole active cause* and all the others merely passive effects. But the whole situation presents a mutual interaction among the various forces on the basis of economic necessity, which latter force ultimately prevails. The State, for instance, exerts an influence by means of protective tariffs, free exchange, good or bad revenue laws; and even the boundless stupidity and impotence of the German petty Bourgeoisie—which grew out of Germany's economic misery during the period from 1648 to 1830, and which first manifested itself in piety, then in sentimentality and fawning servility before the nobles and princes—was not without its economic consequences. It was one of the greatest obstacles to the renaissance and was not shaken off until the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars made the economic wretchedness unbearable. History is not as some would imagine for the sake of their greater convenience, an automatic effect of the economic situation, but men themselves make their own history. Certain it is, however, that *men act in accordance with the prevailing conditions that dominate their field of action*. And among these the economic circumstances, however much influenced by political and ideological forces, are always of chief importance. In the final reckoning they constitute the decisive factor and form the golden thread which guides

the student to the correct, all-comprehensive, understanding of the subject.

(B). Men make their own history, but not as the result of a general volition nor in accordance with some general plan,—not even in a given limited social group. Men's aspirations oppose each other. Out of this circumstance, in every similar group, arises an imperative need whose chance concomitant or accidentality is at once the complement and the form of its manifestation. The need or necessity which here underlies every chance appearance is in the end the economic necessity. The so-called great man appears. But the fact that it happens to be a *certain great man*, appearing at a certain time and at a certain given place, is simply mere chance. But if we eliminate him there arises an immediate demand for a substitute, and this substitute in time found, *tant bien que mal*. That Napoleon became a military dictator—of which the French republic, exhausted by civil wars, stood in need—was merest chance; but that in the event of Napoleon's non-appearance there would have been another to occupy his place is proven by the fact that in every instance in which there was such a need the man was found—Cæsar, Augustus, Cromwell, etc. If it happened to be Marx who discovered the law of historical materialism, yet Thierry, Mignet, Guizot, who up to 1850 were writing English histories, proves that such a notion already existed, and the discovery of the same idea by Morgan further proves that the times were ripe for such an event and the discovery was an *imperative need*.

And so it is with every other true or apparent accidentality in history. The farther the field that we may be examining recedes from the economic, and the nearer it approaches the merely abstract ideologic, the more we shall find—in its evolution—such accidentalities appearing on the scene, and the more does the curve of its evolution fluctuate. If one should attempt, however, to trace the axis of this curve, one should find that the longer the time period observed and the larger the field thus treated, the more nearly does this axis run parallel to the axis of the economic evolution.

In Germany the great hindrance to a true understanding of these things lies in the inexcusable neglect of this subject by the writers of economic history. It is so difficult to rid oneself of the historical conceptions inculcated by schools, and still more difficult to collect the necessary materials. Who, for example, has read old J. V. Julich, who includes in his dry collections so many explanations of various political phenomena!

Moreover, it seems to me the beautiful ex-

ample given us by Marx in his "Eighteenth Brumaire" furnishes a sufficient answer to your questions—the more so because it is a practical illustration. And I believe myself to have touched upon those points in "Anti-Duehring," I., chapters 9–11, II., chapters 2–4, and III., chapter 1, and also in the introduction and in the last chapter of "Feuerbach."

I would ask you not to pass judgment on this letter, but to consider only the thoughts it conveys. I am sorry I have not the time to write you with that exactness I should employ when writing for the public.

Kindly give my regards to Mr. — and thank him for the . . . which has given me much pleasure.

With profound respect,

Most devotedly yours,

E. ENGELS.

GOVERNMENT BY LABOUR

A question which has recently aroused considerable controversy is, "Can Labour Govern?"

Socialists are not so much concerned with the question of whether Labour *can* govern as whether it *should*, or, to put it a better way, whether Labour *need* govern. And on examination of the facts the only possible conclusion we can arrive at is that it need not—and should not.

It is significant that neither of those who have hitherto contributed to the discussion have defined their terms. In this they are quite consistent with their past record. For when apologists of capitalism and their henchmen—the self-styled "labour leaders"—are discussing a given subject, they never attempt to define the terms which they use; the only apparent reason for this is that they know that to do so would be to remove the blinkers from the eyes of those to whom they are appealing.

However, I will rectify the omission.

The word "Govern" means (according to Blackie's "Concise English Dictionary"): "To direct and control; to regulate by authority; to keep within the limits prescribed by law or a sovereign will; to influence; to direct; to restrain; to keep in due subjection; GRAM., to cause to be in a particular case, or to require a particular case.—v.i. To exercise authority." The italics are mine.

There is no need to worry over the question: "Who does Churchill (who started the controversy) and his gang want to govern?" We all know that. But seeing that the spokesmen of the Labour Party are all so greatly concerned to maintain their ability and their right to govern (when they get the chance) it is natural

to ask "Who is it that the Labour Party wish to 'keep in subjection?'" Seeing that the Labour Party, both officially and in the utterances of its representatives, has no conception of politics other than the capitalist view, and seeing, further, that there is no class beneath the working class to be oppressed, obviously it can only be the workers themselves that the Labour Party desires to "keep in due subjection."

Now, in asserting that Labour need not govern it is necessary to submit an alternative. That alternative is Administration.

But before describing this let us state the facts referred to above. They have been already stated numberless times, but it is essential that they be restated, even to the point of weariness, until such time as the workers take the action shown to be necessary by these facts.

(1) Society is, broadly speaking, divided into two classes, the slave class and the slave-owning class.

(2) Between these two classes there is a conflict of interests—centred around the sale and purchase of labour-power—which can be ended only by the abolition of the slave-owners, i.e., the capitalist class.

(3) No one but the slaves themselves can abolish the capitalist class, and so doing achieve the freedom of the workers.

(4) As the slave class, i.e., the working class, is the last class to be emancipated, there is no other class to be exploited, hence the need for government automatically disappears.

Now for our alternative proposal—Administration.

The same dictionary says that to administer is "to manage or conduct as chief agent . . ." and states that the word is derived from the Latin *ministro*, to serve.

The difference, then, between Administration and Government is that the first serves the people and the other represses them. A good example of Administration is to be found in the Constitution of the S.P.G.B.

The control of the affairs of the Party is vested entirely in the membership of the Party. We have certain officials who are responsible for the execution of the instructions given them by the Party. If they fail in this work, or do it in an unsatisfactory manner, they can be removed from office at any time the Party thinks fit.

Apply this principle to the affairs of society, and the point of this article is perceptible at once. While we do not dispute the ability of the master class to govern, we do affirm that they cannot administer, for such a function must necessarily be performed in the interests of the workers, and hence can only be carried out by the workers themselves.

It is self-evident—in view of the state of affairs in “pre-war” times, of the Sidney Street fiasco, of the innumerable war scandals, of the gambles of Mesopotamia and Gallipoli, and the post-war position in which society is plunged, that the real Administration can be born only when the proletariat, having seized political power, use it for the purpose of making the means of production the common property of the whole of society, and proceed to administer them for the common welfare of all. Then the need for the State, for government—“Labour” or otherwise—and the “keeping in due subjection,” will vanish, and mankind will at last be free.

HUTCH.

NOTICES OF SPECIAL MEETINGS.

MEETINGS

will be held by the HACKNEY BRANCH, at SHOREDITCH TOWN HALL on FEBRUARY 8th and 22nd, and MARCH 7th and 21st, 1920. Doors open at 7 p.m. Chair taken at 7.30. Admission Free. Questions and Discussion.

MANCHESTER.

Manchester Branch have arranged a SERIES OF THREE LECTURES, to be given in the ONWARD HALL, 207 DEANSGATE, CITY, MANCHESTER. The first of these Lectures is fixed for JANUARY 20th, and the subject will be “Nationalisation.” The other Lectures will be given on the 3rd and 16th of FEBRUARY respectively. The Chair will be taken at 7.30 p.m. on each occasion. All are heartily welcome, whatever his or her views, and questions will be gratefully accepted and courteously answered.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS FOR FEBRUARY.

LONDON DISTRICT.

Sundays:

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Manor Park, “Earl of Essex,” 7 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.
Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

Fridays:

Battersea, “Prince's Head,” 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 187. Vol. 16.] LONDON, MAR., 1920. [MONTHLY, TWO PENCE

SOME ERRORS OF A SYNDICALIST.

"MY SECOND COUNTRY," by Robert Dell. John Lane, The Bodley Head. 7s. 6d.

Written with sympathy and insight, and in a taking style, this book gives one of the best descriptions of conditions in France that has appeared since the war.

Beginning with an examination of the French character, the author then describes the political Constitution, tracing its developments from the Revolution, and afterwards looks into the economic conditions.

One conclusion that he draws from his survey is that France is bankrupt, and must either repudiate her National Debt or

Face a Revolution.

But Mr. Dell holds out no hope of the former solution, for he believes that while the French Bourgeoisie cannot agree to repudiation, neither will they submit to a heavy capital levy, nor to the huge taxation that would be necessary to tide over the difficulty even temporarily. "These people are quite willing to

Let their Sons be Killed,

said an eminent Frenchman two or three years ago, "but you mustn't ask them for five francs." (P. 191.)

The way in which the French capitalist class have resisted the increase of taxation during the war on the claim that "Germany will have to pay in full," is well described. Now the fact emerges that Germany cannot "pay in full," but no serious attempt is made to meet the situation, and hence Mr. Dell thinks a revolution is inevitable.

He shows the grip of the big financial interests upon the political machine, and thinks the political corruption in France is greater than in England, but as he admits that the thing is done more openly there than here, anyone who

has looked at affairs that have been exposed in England during and since the war will be more inclined to hold the view that the difference, if any, is small, and that it is only a matter of how much more is concealed here.

Combined with this corruption there is a host of forms and methods connected with Politics and Administration that are obsolete and

A Considerable Hindrance

to the smooth working of the machinery. The resentment against these methods and results, coupled with the corruption, leads the author to the conclusion that Parliament as a whole is discredited.

How erroneous is this conclusion is clearly shown by the increased number of people who take part in the elections and still more by the huge struggle between the "interests" for control of Parliament. Among many instances that the author gives is one of the metallurgical industries, of which he says "there is good reason for believing that they prevented the bombardment of the mines of Briey when the latter were held by the Germans." (P. 61.) This action would have been impossible without

Control and use of the Parliament.

The author's study of the economic conditions prevailing in France is, in general, excellent, though a few points call for criticism. Moreover, as it is a question seldom seriously examined by ordinary writers, its treatment adds considerably to the value of the volume.

Mr. Dell claims, and gives good evidence to support the claim, that the ideas engendered by small property or "petty bourgeois" conditions are the prevailing ideas in France. This accounts for the readiness of the people to subscribe for Government loans and similar 'safe'

securities, and their reluctance to invest their money in industrial undertakings at home, though wild cat schemes abroad have strong attractions for them. Hence France is a great lending nation, and this explains the vast control of affairs by the

Purely Financial Interests

as distinct from the industrial ones.

In dealing with the practice of family limitation, a practice French people have carried further than any other nation, Mr. Dell says:

If families have been too much restricted in France that is the result of the economic system. In a capitalist state of society a man without property, who brings into the world a large number of children, is exposing them to the risk of a life of misery.

The limitation of families in France is not due to the selfishness of parents but to their desire only to have children to whom they can give a decent chance in life. (P. 46.)

Now capitalist states of society exist in England, Germany, and other countries as well as in France, yet limitation of families is not practiced to anything like the same extent in those lands. Mr. Dell has failed to note the condition that is, in the main, responsible for the greater limitation of families in France than elsewhere. The reason is to be found in the land system established by the Revolution.

Under this system a proprietor of land cannot leave it to his eldest son, or any other child alone, but must allow it to be divided

Equally among the Children.

The plots, as first shared at the Revolution, were sufficiently large to maintain one family, but were quite inadequate to support two or three. The experience of a generation drove this fact home, and the peasant-proprietors began to limit their families to prevent their plots from being cut up into pieces too small to support a family. The population passing into the towns from the country carry these ideas with them and make the practice prevalent.

In this connection it is certainly surprising to find so acute an observer as Mr. Dell supporting the exploded lies of Malthus, written to justify the misery caused by capitalism in its early days, when, on p. 48, he says: "the world can support in comfort only a certain number of people," and "Malthus only formulated in a theory the conclusions of ordinary good sense."

The former remark simply begs the question—What is this "certain number"? None of us know, except that under Socialism it could be far greater than the present population, even if one only considered that the millions at present

engaged on useless labour or in destruction would then be employed upon productive work. Yet in the same section in which he lends support to the Malthusian sophistry, the author calls for an increase of the population in France when he says:

France can only be saved by a large immigration of adult men, or by a large number of illegitimate children, or both." (P. 51.)

and

The only solution to the problem is the endowment of motherhood whether legitimate or illegitimate. The endowment should be limited to three children. (Pp. 47-48.)

Similar measures were openly advocated in this country during the later stages of the war, when the wholesale slaughter of the male population began to deplete seriously the ranks of the wage slaves. Malthus then, and since, was

Pushed into the Background;

where, doubtless, he will remain till the question of unemployment looms large enough to bring him forward again.

If the French bourgeoisie will not submit to the confiscation of part of their wealth to meet their huge liabilities, what form will the inevitable revolution take? It is here that the author loses a large part of his grip upon essentials.

His admiration for Voltaire is so great that Mr. Dell holds the France of Voltaire as "the great, the true France." This is idealism of the type that looks to the past for its inspiration and guide, and fails to realise that each age must solve its problems with its own materials, and that attempts to revive the dead past must end in failure. Voltaire voiced the views and expressed the ideas of the then new rising class, the bourgeoisie. Those views and ideas do not fit the existing conditions; neither are they any guide to the class now rising to control the social forces, the working class. This class must work out its own salvation from the basis of

Its Own Conditions and Desires,

without any regard for past forms, or blind following of previous systems.

Under the influence of this idealism the author, who announces himself a Socialist, and says "I hope not only to live to see the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also to have the honour of assisting in it" (p. 274), is led to ignore the very facts he so clearly described. He is so obsessed with that insane thing, Syndicalism, that would pit unarmed men against machine guns and aerial bombs, that he advocates the abandonment of political action because it is, he contends, quite useless. He declares: "A Socialist Parliament, with a So-

cialist Government, could not establish Socialism." (P. 260.) If the reader should be rude as to ask why, the only pretence of an answer is found on pages 279-3, where it is said:

Capitalism can never be abolished by Act of Parliament. Seeing the enormous pull the monied interests must always have in an election in our present social conditions, if only because elections cost so much money, I doubt whether a majority would ever be obtained at the polls for the abolition of capitalism.

Even the meanest intelligence should be able to understand that people who are not prepared to vote for Socialism will not take infinitely more troublesome and dangerous methods to establish it. Hence the only conclusion that can be drawn from his statement is—that Socialism is impossible.

But what alternative to political action does our author offer? The following:

The modern revolutionary method is the general strike, not barricades in the street. That is the form that direct action will take, and if the general strike be properly organised, and the strikers hold, it can accomplish in a few days without bloodshed or violence what it would take years or generations to accomplish by constitutional methods, if they could ever accomplish it. (P. 277.)

We have exposed the glaring fallacy of this on numerous occasions, but it will bear repeating.

The first point to note is that for the General Strike to come into operation it is necessary that practically the whole of the workers must have agreed to the strike and its object. Compared with the work and time necessary to obtain this result, the convincing of a majority of the workers of the wisdom of

VOTING for Socialism

would be child's play.

Secondly, the immediate result of a General Strike is the stoppage of the production of foodstuffs. Moreover, the distribution of the foodstuffs existing is prevented.

What, now, are the conditions? This. On one side are the huge numbers of the working class, including the wives and children, whose total means of subsistence consists of the tiny stocks in their cupboards.

On the other side are the relatively small numbers of the capitalist class, whose well-stocked larders will keep them alive long after the workers' stores have vanished.

Result—mass starvation.

But what of the foodstuffs in the stores and granaries? it may be asked. The answer is simple. As the workers have left political power in the hands of the masters, the Government would pass a decree in about ten minutes "commandeering" all available foodstuffs "in the

national interest." These stores would be guarded by soldiers and their contents used to keep the capitalist class and their supporters alive while

The Workers Starved.

"Could not the food producers stay at work and continue to produce food?" it may be argued. Quite likely, and as soon as it was produced it would be seized by the soldiers to feed themselves and the capitalists. Even this does not exhaust the methods open to the masters. When the French railway workers went on strike in 1910 the strike was broken by M. Briand mobilising the men—most of whom were on the Army Reserve—under military orders and then sending them to run the trains as soldiers. What is there existing that would prevent the masters, through the Government, calling upon the workers in the food industries and sending them to produce food, as soldiers, for the master class? Nothing—except the resistance of the unarmed men against the machine gun and the aeroplane.

Mr. Dell claims to be a follower, or acceptor, of Marx's teachings. What distinguished Marx and Engels throughout their career was their clear grasp of the importance of political action. All through their writings runs the slogan—"Every class struggle is a political struggle." Their famous Materialist Conception of History shows how every new rising class in society had to seize the political machinery of its day for the purpose of destroying the old system and establishing the new.

Only when they had conquered this power and were thus able to

Control the Armed Forces

were they in a position to build up the constitution and social methods in harmony with the productive forces of society.

The modern proletariat cannot escape from the conditions that confront it. Until it has wrested the powers of control—the political machinery—from the hands of the master class it cannot own the raw materials, it cannot organise production for its own purposes, it cannot retain the things it manufactures. Whatever differences of opinion may exist as to the particular forms under which Socialism will operate or the details of any interim period that may come, these all fade into insignificance before the two great factors that must first be achieved.

The first is that a majority of the working class must have reached an understanding that social ownership of the means of life is the remedy for the social evils.

(Continued on p. 104.)

I.L.P. FOOLERY.

When we proclaim from our platforms that we are the only Socialist party, and expose the trickery and treachery of other organisations claiming to champion the cause of the working class, we are told that we are only hindering progress, that petty differences in details of policy should be forgotten and an effort made toward a more united action against the common foe. "After all, we are all out for one thing," is a common remark used to round off the plea.

Now this sounds very plausible and pleasing to those who find it difficult, or who are too apathetic, to go below the surface and examine things with something like thoroughness.

The Socialist Party calls for unity among the working class, but the difference between our call and the wail of the organisations which we attack and expose is that our appeal for unity is made as a result of a scientific examination of the facts of working-class experience in modern capitalist society, while theirs is, at the best, merely a manifestation of ignorant enthusiasm and impatience.

We lay it down that the condition of our class is one of wage slavery; we recognise the antagonism of interests manifesting itself as a class struggle between those who produce but do not possess and those who possess but do not produce, between the employed and the employers, the robbed and the robbers.

This struggle is what is known as the class war, and it is upon a recognition of these fundamental principles that our actions are based.

How, then, could we ally ourselves with such a hotch-potch of confusion and calculated treachery as constitutes the I.L.P., who, at the Amsterdam International Congress in 1904, while voting for a resolution extolling the "tried and victorious policy based on the class war," declared on their return to England that the class war was a "shibboleth" and a "reactionary and Whiggish precept, certain to lead the movement away from the real aims of Socialism."—"Labour Leader," 26.8.04.

Further, listen to what Mr. J. Ramsay MacDonald says: "The Socialist movement knows no class, but is drawn from all classes. . . . So I sum up the Labour Party is not a class, but a community party."—"Labour Leader," 21.6.09.

Again: "I want the serious men of the trade unions, the brotherhoods, and similar movements, to face their duty. To such men it is enough to say 'England has need of you' and to say it in the right way."—"Daily Chronicle," 14.9.14. This was in a letter to a major in charge of a recruiting meeting.

Here we have direct repudiations of the class

war and treachery of the vilest kind. Nevertheless they call themselves "Independent." Why they should tack this word on to their title the Lord High Hobo only knows. It means, seemingly, that they are independent of principle, quite free to say what they like, bargain with whom they like, betray when and where they like.

They I.L.P., however, do perform very useful functions—for the master class. They form a convenient hothouse for budding aspirants to fame and position in the Trade Union movement and the ranks of the Labour Party; and as a means of spreading confusion among the working class, on questions which vitally affect their interests, such as politics, trade unionism, etc., there is no doubt that they merit the support which they obtain from the finances of the master class.

With these few introductory observations I come to the pith of my argument. In glancing through the "Labour Leader" for February 12, last, we find a pronouncement urging I.L.P. branches to organise "large demonstrations" for the following objects:

- (1) To protest against the monstrous terms of the Peace Treaty.
- (2) To demand the drastic revision of its terms.
- (3) To affirm the solidarity of the Party with the Socialist Parties of the World.
- (4) To assert that the I.L.P. opposed the war because of its International policy, and stands for a JUST and LASTING Peace.

The first two items, notwithstanding the wishes of the I.L.P., will be decided in accordance with the interests of the victorious capitalists. The terms of the Peace Treaty, even if they were known, are no concern of the working class whatever. It is a capitalist peace and as such concerns only the capitalist class, and they obviously, as long as they have the power, will continue to arrange things to suit *their* interest. The "monstrous terms" are imposed by one set of capitalists upon another set, and just as the workers of this country will have no share in the plunder, so will the hardships of the toilers of the defeated nations be not increased or diminished, whatever the terms imposed upon their masters. A man cuts his horse's rations to the lowest point it can drag its burden on, and consequently gets fined for working the animal in an unfit condition. Can the horse pay the fine? This protest is, therefore, purely a stunt on the part of the I.L.P. to seize an opportunity to advertise themselves and switch the minds of the working class off the things that matter.

Item 3—It has already been shown that, by their repudiation of the class struggle the I.L.P.

have alienated themselves from the Socialist movement. Their desire, therefore, to affirm their "solidarity with the Socialist parties of the world" is empty phrase-mongering.

Item 4.—The first part is a direct lie, and goes to show to what depths they are prepared to sink and how insanely credulous they consider the rank and file are.

Most of the prominent men in the I.L.P. assisted in the recruiting campaign; moreover, the Labour Party, to whom the party are affiliated, supported the war and assisted in recruiting, and in the organisation of "patriotic" meetings.

Further, their delegates to the Conference of "Socialists" of the Allied Nations in 1915 supported the resolution that the "Socialists" were "inflexibly resolved to fight until victory is achieved." When some of the delegates protested at the 22nd Annual Conference, Mr. Bruce Glazier said "the members of the I.L.P. who were present at the gathering were not there as representatives of the party, but as members of the International Bureau."

Again, in the official I.L.P. pamphlet entitled "How the War Came," occurs the following: "Obviously the war must be finished now."

And finally, at the 23rd Annual Conference Mr. Bruce Glazier said: "They had dissociated the party from the political recruiting campaign, but they had left it to every member to recruit if he thought well to do so, and, if he thought it his duty, to ask his neighbour to recruit."

Just notice the charming "independence" that prevails. And this is the organisation which is going to achieve working-class emancipation! The ruling class are safe as long as they can encourage such confusion of thought.

The resolutions which the I.L.P. branches are urged to move at the demonstrations referred to are just as weird and ridiculous. They state, for instance, that the meeting "affirms its belief in the ideal of Human Brotherhood. . . ." These are mere glow words. No such thing can exist under capitalism, not even in the I.L.P. They say it with their tongues in their cheeks. Then the resolutions go on to talk about securing "equal rights of social and economic development to all nations, to adjust all differences of boundary and race in the light of the permanent interest of civilisation and the mutual rights of all peoples."

There is displayed in these resolutions a gross ignorance of the laws operating under capitalism. The development of the means of production is the deciding factor, and it is only when society becomes a harmonious organism, i.e., when social, instead of private, ownership of the instruments of labour complements social

production, resulting in social appropriation of the labour products, that human kind will be able to enjoy the fruits of their industry.

Until that time arrives, until the economic forces have developed to the point where the Social Revolution becomes an inevitable necessity, the task of the Socialist Party will be to prepare the minds of the people for the great event—for the birth of the new social order; to organise the workers on the political field for the capture of the powers of government.

Blazoned on its banners will be, the watch words: "Workers of the World, unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to win." O. C. I.

SOME SOCIALIST PARTY!

The following is an extract taken from an Ealing newspaper, "The Gazette," of January 24th, 1920:

NATIONAL SOCIALIST PARTY.

The N.S.P. would not, as Lenin would, wipe out the Bourgeois or Middle Classes, in Ealing and elsewhere. It would try to teach them that social service is the highest service, . . .

We need only take its title to prove how ridiculous is the claim of the N.S.P. to be a Socialist organisation. Socialists recognise that the class struggle exists in various forms in every part of the civilised world. The exploitation of the workers is a fact whether they be white, black, brown, yellow—or green, as someone with a strong vein of sarcastic humour has suggested. Therefore the Socialist can recognise no NATIONAL differences, but must work steadily for the INTERNATIONAL emancipation of the working class.

The N.S.P. state that they have no intention of wiping out the "Bourgeois or Middle Class." Presumably in order to lay claim to the title of Socialist, one must possess at least a rudimentary knowledge of Socialist economics. Yet here is an organisation terming itself a Socialist party, that confesses to an utter ignorance of Socialist principles in the very statement by which it hopes to gain adherents.

It is obvious that if a knowledge of Socialism is lacking, the aims for which an organisation professes to strive must also be lacking of any sound and tangible foundation.

It should be quite easily understood that, under a system of society based upon the ownership and control of the means of production and distribution by the whole community, for and in the interest of the whole of the people, classes will automatically cease to exist, a fact which the so-called Socialists of the N.S.P. have evidently failed to grasp.

Continued on p. 111.

THE MEANING OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

The most significant point about the question of unemployment is that it should be prevalent, and a subject of general attention, at the same time that increased production is being so strenuously advocated by our masters. The two things, unemployment and the need for greater production, existing side by side, are as inconsistent as the conditions so peculiar to industrial crises—increased starvation in the midst of plenty. Those who attempt to explain away the inconsistency do so by attributing it to the change from war-time to peace-time occupations. Quite recently Mr. Lloyd George has tried to make it appear that the trade unions, because they oppose his dilution scheme, are to blame for what unemployment there is. But as no occupation has, up till now, absorbed all its own unemployed, such a charge is utterly preposterous.

That the prevailing unemployment is due to the change from war-time to peace-time occupations will not do. Unemployment, always a feature of capitalist production, had reached an acute stage long before the outbreak of war. So acute had it become that two capitalist governments, at least, had felt impelled to establish unemployed insurance. Not that the Insurance Acts really insured the workers against unemployment, or that it was ever intended that they should by the cunning politicians who engineered them. Such a course would tend to disrupt the capitalist system, because the whip of hunger which drives the workers into the mills and factories for low wages would cease to operate.

A most significant fact about the insurance Act was that those responsible for it supported it by evidence as to the appalling poverty of the working class; and indeed, that the workers who needed such an act must have been poor—desperately poor—will be the verdict of future generations.

The Act that was to deal with this degrading poverty was mean and paltry in its scope and achievement—a pill for an earthquake; and it must be evident that along such lines as these the problem of unemployment is impossible of solution. No capitalist government will carry the scheme to the point where the unemployed can live on the donation, while, on the other hand, no capitalist government can check the development of industrial processes, which increase the number of unemployed.

But does that mean that the unemployed problem is impossible of solution? By no means. All that it implies is that it is against the

interests of the capitalist class to make an honest attempt at solution. The solution must, therefore, rest with the working class, first because they are the class that suffer, and second because the ruling class have no need or desire for a solution.

To those who refuse to credit this indifference of the ruling class toward the sufferings of the unemployed it is only necessary to point out that the chief argument used against the continuance of the unemployment dole was that some men and women were refusing jobs while it was possible to obtain the dole. That the dole in some cases was actually higher than the wages offered did not enter into the argument, though in itself a biting commentary on the system.

Three points stand out clearly:

(1) Unemployment increases with the development of capitalism.

(2) Unemployment is not due to superficial causes like the change from war-time to peace-time occupations, but is inherent in the system.

(3) It is against the interests of the ruling class to attempt a solution.

Of course, capitalist defenders will never admit these facts as being the basis of the problem. Generally they refuse to discuss them and, adopting an optimistic tone, talk endless platitudes about small beginnings, and smaller results.

The first point, that unemployment increases with the development of capitalism, is proved by the statistics published from time to time by the capitalists themselves. According to the "Daily News Year Book," 1910, in the ten years from 1899 to 1908, the foreign trade of this country rose from 814 millions to 1,049 millions, an increase of over 200 millions, while the estimated unemployed, who in 1899 numbered 332,000, rose to 1,330,000 in 1901, the actual percentage of unemployed rising from 2.5 to 8.8 during ten years of unexampled prosperity.

To-day, in spite of what unemployment there is—and government figures only relate to those registered at the Labour Exchanges—foreign trade goes up by leaps and bounds in this country. The January report of the value of the exports shows it to be the highest on record. But against this unequalled trade prosperity has to be set the general stagnation in the rest of European countries, where, once more according to capitalist authorities, there are millions of unemployed.

To this stagnation abroad England's trade prosperity is largely due. When competition is resumed unemployment here will increase as it decreases abroad, because foreign countries will have a surplus of wealth to export as they did before the war. But with all the boasted

prosperity of this country, unemployment is still extensive, far more extensive than the Premier would have us believe. Mr. Clynes, who nevertheless claims that greater output per individual will benefit the workers, proved in the House of Commons last December that "at Newcastle," one of the places where a shortage of workers was said to exist, "there were 7,000 workers unemployed, the numbers were increasing at an alarming rate, and thousands have been thrown on the verge of starvation by the withdrawal of the donation." ("Parliamentary Debates," December 17, 1919, cols. 290-291.) "Our" enormous trade prosperity, therefore, still leaves us with many thousands of unemployed, and is chiefly built up on the stagnation of foreign countries. Capitalism is still international, in spite of the quarrels between national groups of capitalists. The results of capitalism have, therefore, to be taken internationally, and the unemployed of all countries must be reckoned against the system.

The second point, that unemployment is not due to superficial causes like the change from war-time to peace-time occupations, but is inherent in the system, is partially proved by its permanency. That it increases with the development of the system is a further proof: the more capitalism we have the more unemployment we get. But the strongest proof of all is the reasoned proof, the logical deduction from the facts.

If industrial progress means that the number of workers required to produce a given quantity of wealth is constantly diminishing, there can only be one result: a progressive increase in the number of unemployed. But there can be no relief, even, for the workers of any country that might succeed in outstripping its competitors, because the capitalists of any such country would take steps to keep up the supply of labour-power from those countries which had a dangerous surplus. Which brings us to the third point.

Unemployment is necessary to capitalism. It is, therefore, against the interests of the ruling class to attempt a solution. Capitalists want enough unemployment to compel the workers to submit to their terms and conditions, but no so much as will cause desperation and unrest, with its accompanying acceptance of the Socialist explanation and remedy. Capitalist experiments in unemployed insurance are attempts to ascertain this medium and nothing more. Such schemes can only have a palliative effect of small value to the workers.

All the labour leaders, capitalist politicians, and economists who demand greater production, do so on the grounds that a larger share of foreign markets would fall to the capitalists of

their country as a result. But as foreign labour-power flows into a prosperous country faster than it can be absorbed—or displaces native labour-power because it is cheaper—the conditions of the workers in the more prosperous countries would not be materially improved.

While labour-power is a commodity its owners must sell it; and no matter where it is in demand, they must offer themselves for exploitation or starve. The capitalist only buys labour-power for the purpose of exploiting the seller.

All the cant and hypocrisy that is talked or written about the good services rendered by the capitalists to the workers in finding them work cannot conceal the fact that the capitalist method of production is merely a veiled form of robbery; and robbery, either veiled or open, is a hostile act. Capitalism, therefore, being based on the robbery of the working class by the master class, is in its very essence a system based on the antagonism of classes.

Controlling the means of wealth production and the political machine, the ruling class have the workers educated to believe in the excellence and permanence of their system. They suppress by physical force every rising of the workers against their authority, whether such risings take the form of revolution or attempts to raise wages by withholding labour-power, as in a strike.

With the increase of unemployment due to the development of capitalism, and the commodity character of human labour-power, class antagonism becomes more pronounced. The workers see on every hand evidence of enormous prosperity in which they do not share, and every effort they make to improve their conditions, within the system, is opposed by physical force. They cannot help coming to the conclusion, therefore, that unemployment is regarded by the capitalist class as being necessary to their system, and consequently something that must be preserved. Behind all the cant and humbug of capitalist reformers is the stern determination to maintain society in its present form. Unemployment cannot be abolished within the system. Nothing remains for the workers, therefore, but to realise this fact with all it conveys, and organise with us for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a system of society where improved methods of production will not mean poverty and suffering, as now, but increased time and opportunities for enjoyment and recreation. F. F.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free ...	1s. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " " " "	9d.

The Socialist Standard,



MONDAY,

MAR. 1, 1920.

CONCERNING OURSELVES.

We prophesied last month that "your 'S.S.' would cost you more," and lo! it has come about. The truth is, of course, that we did not prophesy before we knew, which may be accounted unto us for wisdom; and if the warning was brief, and tucked away in what in any other paper would be an obscure corner, it was not with the idea of preventing the knowing ones from laying in a big stock before the price rose—though it must be admitted that the more we sold at a penny the more we lost.

No! such sordid considerations are beneath us. We are poor, but we hope we are large-minded enough to say that anyone is welcome to buy as many copies of "ours" as he likes—for cash—whatever the price we are charging. The fact is that it was only at the last hour that the decision was arrived at to take advantage of the Profiteering Act, and time and space only permitted of a brief announcement.

And so the SOCIALIST STANDARD is now twopence, if you please. Doubtless when the Commission of Enquiry has got through with Messrs. Coats they will turn their attention to us, so we will reserve for them the facts relating to the abandonment of our policy of giving our paper away; meanwhile may we suggest that though the purchaser of "ours" cannot hope to find relief in seeking a substitute, "cos there ain't none," he can economise by reading his copy twice, or, better still, by putting it in circulation among his friends.

Our Annual Conference will this year be held at Fairfax Hall, Portland Gardens, Harringay,

N., on 2nd and 3rd April. The Annual Reunion of Members will be held in the same Hall on the evening of the first day (Good Friday) Commence 7 o'clock.

HIS MAJESTY KING CLYNES.

In a letter to a Herefordshire lieutenant-colonel a copy of which he sent to the "Times," J. R. Clynes said (according to the "Evening News," 30.1.20.): "Always I have expressed my gratitude and thankfulness for the sacrifices and valour of the thousands of rich young men who left everything and faced the risks of war."

Clynes should be careful—it was this spirit of bumptious, inflated importance on the part of the other Kaiser that, according to some people, caused the war. A. A.

SOME ERRORS OF A SYNDICALIST.

(Continued.)

The other is that before they can put any form of social ownership into operation they must seize the power necessary to take control.

To the workers who have had actual contact and conflict with the powers wielded by the master class, it seems astonishing that men of the professional section who take up the study of social conditions should be so blind to these facts. The workers, in the main, are being converted to Socialism by the pressure of the class war, and not by the immature theories of the "intellectuals." Thus while granting praise for so much acute observation, presented in good they will reject the misunderstanding by the author of the lessons to be drawn from the facts. J. FITZGERALD.

READY SHORTLY.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

SIXTH EDITION,

WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence.

Post free, 3½d. per copy, from the S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

THE THIEVES' KITCHEN RECORDS.

As usual, the old farce of the Kings' Speech to Parliament was carried out with mock solemnity and cobwebs, a la Dirty Dick and King Solomon. Considering that it is now some sixteen months since the war actually ceased—the war which was to inaugurate a "beautiful new world" for the workers of this country, the Speech offers nothing but flap-doodle touching on this point, and precious little even of that.

In fact, the only indication of anything tangible, in connection with this matter of "everything for nothing" for the working class, has to be read into, or got out of, the royal announcement that He (G. Wettin) has "had great pleasure in assenting to the proposal that the Prince of

Wales should visit Australia and New Zealand and should take the opportunity on his return voyage of seeing some of My West Indian possessions." So it seems that the King gives his only begotten (if he hadn't begotten any others) son in order that the workers may enjoy by proxy all the delights that the "beautiful new world" has to offer, what time they are slogging into the task of increasing production to enable the pound sterling to "look the dollar in the face." May the thought sustain them in their monotonous any wearisome labours, until the young man returns and his father finds him a job of work to take some of the weight off Ole Bill's shoulder, and enable Tom Smith to let go long enough to spit on his hand—may the reflection sustain and refresh them, I say, and revive their drooping spirits, and renew their ebbing strength, and soothe their aching limbs, and charm away the pains of their cramped and pitiless occupations, for nothing else in King Capital's Gracious speech will.

In the Thieves' Kitchen there were prior to the war, in addition to the old hands at the game, who had been in the business donkey's years before Blueskin and Jack Shepherd were thought of, a new group of approximately forty, of whom it may be said that, though they were only minors in the matter of gollapping up the swag, were the most active and assiduous in supporting

and forwarding any scheme afoot for the robbery of the human bees, possibly for the same reason that the petty sneak thief is the most active member of other thieves' kitchens—he has to do a big business to keep up his fat. Of these forty many a year or so ago got soused in boiling oil—which is no loss to public life. But some have survived even unto this day, and

their reception of the Speech was characteristic. Mr. Adamson, the leader of the Lib-Labs, in his comic-opera role of leader of the Opposition, opened: "I desire to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder for the excellent

speeches . . ." et so on ad vomitum. That was about the limit of his "opposition." He was glad to note that the mover of the Address had "struck a very optimistic vein, and

thought we would be able to overcome these difficulties [the "aftermath of the war"] in the manner in which we have been able to overcome the difficulties of the past. This is a welcoming and supporting of smug capitalist complacency which should be noted by all workers who are satisfied with the way in which "the difficulties of the past" have been overcome, and especially those workers who elected Mr. Adamson to represent THEM.

In the debate on the Address the question of Russia arose, and in replying Mr. Liar George became really funny. "The horrors of Bolshevism have revolted the consciences of mankind," said he who has taken no step to purge British Authority of the dastardly massacre of Amritsar. "The first war on opinion was made by the Bolsheviks when they dissolved the National Assembly," wailed he who for five years has tyrannised under that garrotter's outfit of noose and bludgeon and pitch-plaster—D.O.R.A. "We were bound to give the anti-Bolsheviks their chance to recover Russia. . . ." We were bound by considerations of honour," cried he whose considerations of honour never prevented him breaking pledges given to his working-class dupes. "There is no government in Russia which can speak for any defined area.

It is perfectly true that the Bolsheviks have over-run the Ukraine and part of the Cossack land, but they have only been there a few weeks and they have been there

before. I do not say that General Denikin will drive them out, but no one can tell whether the Ukrainians will tolerate them. No one can say whether the Cossacks will tolerate them in their country." So again spoke the spokesman of the Thieves' Kitchen. And it is strikingly strange how every one of his arguments might have been used with even greater force to deter him and his gang from conceding to Denikin and—what's his name, Coldchuck?—the right to speak for, not only people of territories it was doubtful if they could hold, but of territories they did not occupy.

Of course, no member of the "Labour" Opposition had the courage to open his mouth to say these things, notwithstanding the professed

Bolshevik sympathies of many of them. They, grateful dogs, respect the hand that feeds them.

On the second day of the Debate on the Address Mr. Brace moved an amendment regretting "the absence of any proposal to nationalise the mines of the country . . ." He had a pretty good turn before three o'clock, and he carried on well after four, but he contributed nothing to the cause of the

Hands off! workers, but something to the cause of the masters. Here are samples of his arguments:

Profits! "An hon. Member asks me, 'Suppose it does not pay?' But it must pay! . . . In addition to paying interest on the Bonds it must find money towards a sinking fund to redeem the Bonds. Indeed it must find profit for national purposes. For the mines are to be worked not to produce profit for a few people, but for the whole."

So the capitalist Shylock is to have his pound of flesh—the Labour Party will see to that. The mines are to be run for profit to pay capitalist State expenses; and to provide interest on capitalist Bonds; and to redeem those Bonds so the mines shall become the property of the whole of the capitalists instead of of a few of them. The capitalists will lose nothing—the Labour Party will see to that.

On the other hand, Mr. Brace and those for whom he spoke were thoughtful enough to provide additional shackles for the miners, for he embraced the following from the Sankey Report:

The contracts of employment of workmen shall embody an undertaking . . . that no workman will, in consequence of any dispute, join in giving notice to determine his contract, nor will he combine to cease work, unless and until the question in dispute has been before the Local Mining Council and the District Mining Council and those Councils have failed to settle the dispute.

That is the sort of strangle hold the Labour Party are ready to get fixed on the workers—the treacherous hounds! We have only to consider how long we have been kept in the shackles of D.O.R.A., under the pretence that the war is not yet finished, to imagine what tricks the ruling class could play with that phrase "failed to settle the dispute."

The Prime Minister butted in in due course, and as usual indulged in cant

Welsh so open and shameless as to suggest an utter lack of the sense of humour on his part. He wanted

Humbug an illustration, and turned, of course, to the workers of Russia,

who, he said "are to be told [by the State] where they are to work—not in what particular factory, but in what particular town or locality. The State is to say to them 'You are no use

here; you must go to another village, which is 100 miles away."

This the speaker called labour conscription. But one would think that he, Mr. Lloyd George, would be the last to drag that in, when one remembers how many thousands of men were sent, under his tyranny, not one hundred miles but three hundred, not only to certain districts but to particular factories. He did not call that labour conscription, the canting hypocrite!

In the debate on Supplies on Feb. 10th Mr. Lloyd George received the lie direct regarding the whole tissue of falsehoods with which he has supported his sneak-thief, under-hand, shame-faced policy of British intervention in Russia. Lieut.-Colonel Malone, taking the Government to task for treacherously supplying

The Straight Griffin. arms, munitions, and forces against a people who are still technically their allies, had many things to say which no member of the Government, nor any supporter of their policy, had the courage to attempt to controvert. Here are some of Lieut.-Colonel Malone's remarks:

"I see that General Knox declared publicly a short time ago that it is no use keeping Bolsheviks in prison; that it is much the better plan to shoot them without trial. . . . Yesterday General Knox was granted the K.C.B. Was it for that he was granted the K.C.B., or was it for organising the Koltchak regime? Who were the men who surrounded Admiral Koltchak? Unelected, unnominated, unconstitutionally elected people, who had no connection with the Russian people. . . ."

"I now pass to General Denikin. I will not burden the House by repeating the terrible list of atrocities which have been reported concerning territories occupied by Gen. Denikin. I will only mention one or two." The speaker then gave details of massacres, rape, branding and other villanies committed by the Denikinists which all the elaboration of capitalist hatred, could not surpass in their charges against the Bolsheviks. He then showed, from the evidence of correspondents serving with Denikin, what sort of man the "saviour of Russia" is, and drew attention to the case of the G.O.C., North Command parading his officers and men to "listen to one of these propaganda lectures by a certain reverend gentleman, a member of the Church of England, . . . which is intended to stir up hate against the Soviet population." Later the speaker squarely challenged Mr. George on his statement that the Bolsheviks had sold guns to the Germans to be used against the British. The cowards who followed wisely changed the subject. A. E. J.

The Picture Reversed.

the case of the G.O.C., North Command parading his officers and men to "listen to one of these propaganda lectures by a certain reverend gentleman, a member of the Church of England, . . . which is intended to stir up hate against the Soviet population." Later the speaker squarely challenged Mr. George on his statement that the Bolsheviks had sold guns to the Germans to be used against the British. The cowards who followed wisely changed the subject. A. E. J.

THE MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY.

A FURTHER LETTER ON THIS SUBJECT.

By FREDERICK ENGELS.

Translated for the "Proletarian" by Prof. J. I. Cheskis, of the University of Michigan.

A young student addressed to Engels the following questions:

1. How is it that, after the consanguineous family ceased to exist, marriage between brothers and sisters was still permitted by the Greeks, as Cornelius Nepos attests?

2. How was the fundamental principle of historical materialism understood by Marx and Engels themselves; are the production and reproduction of actual life alone the determining factors, or are they only the basis of all the other conditions acting by themselves?

Frederick Engels replied:

London, Sept. 21, 1890.

Dear Sir,

Your letter of the 3rd inst. was forwarded to me at Folkestone; but not having the book I needed I could not reply. Having returned on the 12th of the same month, I found such an amount of pressing work that only to-day am I able to write a few lines. Please excuse my delay.

To your first question;—First of all you can see on p. 19 of my "Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," the Punalua family is represented as developing so slowly that even in this century in the royal family there have been marriages between brothers and sisters. In antiquity we find examples of marriages between brothers and sisters, for instance, the Ptolemies. We must make a distinction between brothers and sisters on the mothers' side and brothers and sisters on the fathers' side. The Greek Adelphos (brother) and Adelphon (sister) are both derived from Delphos (mother), indicating thus the origin of brother and sister on the mother's side. And from the period of the Matriarchate there has been preserved for a long time the feeling that the children of one mother but of different fathers are more closely related than the children of one father but by different mothers. The Punalua form of the family excludes only marriages among the first, not among the second, since the latter, while the Matriarchate lasted, were not even considered relatives. Cases of matrimony between brothers and sisters in Ancient Greece are limited to those in which the contracting parties are descended from different mothers, or to those of whom the parental relationship was unknown, and hence the

marriage was not forbidden. This, therefore, is not absolutely in contrast with the Punalua custom. You have noticed, then, that between the Punalua period and Greek monogamy there is a jump from the Matriarchate to the Patriarchate, which changes things considerably.

According to the "Greek Antiquities" of Wachsmuth, one finds in the heroic period of Greece "no trace of scruples due to a too close relationship of the contracting parties independently of the relationship between the parents and children." (P. 156.) "Marriage with a carnal sister was not at all scandalous in Crete." (Ibid, p. 170.) This last affirmation is based on Strabone (X) but at the present moment I cannot find this passage because of faulty division of chapters. Under the expression "carnal sister" I understand, until proof to the contrary is furnished, a sister on the part of the father.

To the second question:—

I have interpreted your first main phrase in the following way: According to the Materialist Conception of History, the factor which is in the last instance decisive in history is the production and reproduction of actual life. More than this neither Marx nor myself ever claimed. If now someone has distorted the meaning in such a way that the economic factor is the *only* decisive one, this man has changed the above proposition into an abstract, absurd phrase which says nothing. The economic situation is the base, but the different parts of the structure,—the political forms of the class struggle and its results, the constitutions established by the victorious class after the battle is won, forms of law and even the reflections of all these real struggles in the brains of the participants, political theories, juridical philosophical, religious opinions, and their further development into dogmatic systems—all this exercises also its influence on the development of the historical struggles and in cases determines their form. It is under the mutual influence of all these factors that, rejecting the infinitesimal number of accidental occurrences (that is, things and happenings whose intimate sense is so far removed and of so little probability that we can consider them non-existent, and can ignore them), that the economical movement is ultimately carried out. Otherwise the application of the theory to any period of history would be easier than the solution of any simple equation. We ourselves make our history, but, primarily, under pre-suppositions and conditions which are very well determined. But even the political tradition, nay, even the tradition that man creates in his head, plays an important part even if not the decisive one. The Prussian State has itself been born and

developed because of certain historical reasons, and, in the last instance, economic reasons. But it is very difficult to determine without pedantry that, among the many small States of northern Germany, precisely Brandenburg has been destined by economic necessity and not also by other factors (above all its complications with Poland after the Prussian conquest and hence, also, with international politics—which, besides has also been decisive in the formation of the power of the Austrian ruling family), to become that great power in which are personified the economic, linguistic, and—after the Reformation—also the religious difference between the North and South. It would be mighty difficult for one who does not want to make himself ridiculous to explain from the economic point of view the existence of each small German State of the past and present, or even the phonetic differentiation of High German which extended the geographic division formed already by the Sudetti mountains as far as the Faunus.

In the second place history forms itself in such a way that the ultimate result springs always from the conflicts of many individual wills, each of which in its turn is produced by a quantity of special conditions of life; there are thus innumerable forces which cross each other, an infinite group of parallelograms of forces, from which is derived one resultant—the historical event—which in its turn again can be considered as the product of an active power, as a whole unconsciously and involuntarily, because that which each individual wishes is prevented by every other, and that which results from it is a thing which no one has wished. In this way history runs its course like a natural process, and is substantially the same laws of motion. But, because of the fact that the individual wills—each of which wishes that to which it is impelled by its own physical constitution or exterior circumstances, i.e., in the last analysis, all economic circumstances (either its own personal circumstances or the general conditions of society)—do not reach that which they seek but are fused in one general media in a common resultant, by this fact one cannot conclude that they are equal to zero. On the contrary, each contributes to produce the resultant, and is contained in it.

I would further ask you to study the theory from its original sources and not from second-hand works; it is really much easier. One can say that Marx has written nothing in which some part of the theory is not found. An excellent example of its application in a specific way is the "Eighteenth Brumaire of L. Bonaparte." Also in "Capital" (III) are many illustrations. And also permit me to recommend to you my writings, Herr E. Duhring's "Unwanzung der

Wissenschaft," and "Feuerbach und der Ausgang der Klassischen deutschen Philosophie," in which I have given the most ample illustrations of Historical Materialism which to my knowledge exists. That the young people give to the economic factor more importance than belongs to it is in part the fault of Marx and myself. Facing our adversaries we had to lay especial stress on the essential principle denied by them, and, besides, we had not always the time, place, or occasion to assign to the other factors which participate in producing the reciprocal effect, the part which belongs to them. But scarcely has one come to the representation of a particular historical period, that is, to a practical application of the theory, when things changed their aspect, and such an error was no longer permissible. It happens too often that one believes he has perfectly understood a new theory, and is able to manage it without any aid, when he has scarcely learned the first principles, and not even those correctly. This reproach I cannot spare to some of our new Marxists; and in truth it has been written by the wearer of the marvellous robe himself. (That is, by Marx.—Editor.)

To the first question:—Yesterday (I am writing these words on the 22nd of Sept.) I also found in Schomann, "Greek Antiquities," Berlin, 1855, Vol I, p. 52, the following words, which confirm definitely the explanation given by me. "It is noteworthy that in later Greece marriages between brothers and sisters of different mothers were not considered incest."

I hope you will not be dismayed by the terrible parentheses which for the sake of brevity overflow from my pen. And I subscribe myself
Your devoted,
E. ENGELS.

AFTER SEEING A PERFORMANCE OF "THE TROJAN WOMEN."

What though you beat the earth and cry aloud
To all the dead that you have loved and lost;
Shall one arise and cast aside his shroud
To help and save you, hell-bound, tempest
tossed

On the sad world's waters? Rise from off your
knees

And face life fearlessly whate'er portend.
The wheels of Fate, despite your futile pleas,
Roll on, unheeding, to their destined end.
And still men cry and clamour to the dead,
Or pray for aid to gods and other men;
And still Fate crushes them and passes by.
The night comes swiftly; even now the red,
The blood-red sunset, like an open wen,
Creeps in its course across the darkening sky.

E. J. WEBB.

BY THE WAY.

The number of bye-elections which have lately taken place has caused a lively interest to be taken in things political. Perhaps the contest at Paisley has been the election most in the public eye, owing to the fact that one of the candidates was the "hero of Featherstone," H. H. Asquith. Liberalism having of late received a set-back, the eyes of the "Wee-Free Liberals" were turned toward Paisley in the hope that the honourable Herbert would re-declare the Liberal faith and, if possible, help once again to close up their scattered ranks.

However, the point to which I desire to draw attention is contained in a question addressed to Mr. Asquith at the conclusion of one of his electioneering speeches and the reply he made thereto. The following is the dialogue:—

An elector asked if when he was Prime Minister he considered 12s. 6d. a week sufficient to maintain a soldier's wife, and why he didn't take steps to increase it?

Mr. Asquith: I believe the figure you quote is correct, but it was done with the concert, co-operation and advice of Mr. Arthur Henderson.—"Daily News," Jan. 28th, 1920.

Though this reply of the wily one was smart and possibly might have the effect of telling against his "labour opponent," yet the mere fact that the prominent labour leaders, from the very commencement of the war down to the ratification of the "peace" treaty with Germany, were assisting the capitalist politicians to maim and kill other members of the working class, carries with it joint responsibility for all acts done in furtherance of the war.

The question and answer quoted above reveals a specific instance of this joint responsibility, and is another illustration of the treachery of these self-styled labour leaders.

At another public meeting addressed by the ex-Prime Minister a somewhat new type of question was addressed to the speaker. Indeed, it is a welcome change from the question of the ordinary kind, where the questioner wants to know why we cannot have pensions at 65 years of age, or should co-operators' "divvy" be subject to taxation, and so on. This kind of question may be interesting from some points of view, but it presupposes a continuance of capitalist conditions.

To return to the subject of the question, I note that on this occasion most of the interrogations were handed to the chairman in writing, and the first was:

If the people want Socialism, can they get it?
That, replied Mr. Asquith, depends on the electorate.
—"Daily Express," Jan. 20th, 1920.

Now we of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, want Socialism. We want it because it is the only "ism" that can and will abolish the struggle for existence. It will remove the anomaly of starvation and misery in the midst of plenty. It will end the day of the wage-slave and the slave master. In society to-day there are two classes, the master class and the working class: the former owning the means of wealth production and the latter alone operating them. While we, the working class, socially produce the things needful for man's use, at the conclusion of the operation the product is individually owned—by the capitalists. The capitalist class, therefore, waxes fat on the unpaid labour of the working class. The reward of the workers for their toil is a bare minimum of existence while they are young and vigorous, and when they get old, then, in the words of Mr. Claud Lowther, of the Anti-Socialist Union, "the goal of honest toil is the workhouse."

We seek the co-operation of our fellow workers to hasten the day of our emancipation.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, exists as a propagandist organisation preaching Socialism to the multitude by word of mouth and by the printed page. To all those who are asking a similar question to that quoted above we say: study Socialism, and if you desire it come and join us and help to secure it. While you remain unorganised your identity is obscured. Organise, then, with others of your class and help to spread the light.

Our masters and pastors who so jauntily set out in 1914 to "make the world safe for democracy" and to dethrone Prussian militarism, are "getting the wind up" rather badly now that their noble aims have been achieved.

During the "fight for freedom" we had frequently dished up in the Press many phrases which did service as a stimulus to recruiting. We were told that war brought out the best that was in us (the bad was quietly and conveniently forgotten), and many went into ecstasy when dilating on the "purifying flame of war." Now that the war "over there" is a thing of the past, and the one-time heroes have returned to industrial monotony and a vain endeavour to find an employer to exploit them, our bosses are getting a little perturbed at the prospect of these "new" criminals applying Army methods to civil life. In this connection the following extract is illuminating:

Not only does war not "purify": it eats like a cancer into the morals of all the nations engaged in it.

victorious or vanquished. Its effect upon sexual morality is too obvious to need more than a mention. And now, too, we begin to note its reactions upon the minds of many whom it has trained to brutality and violence.

Let us remember these things—and indeed we shall be constantly reminded of them by the facts of daily life when next a patriotic stay-at-home rises in some newspaper pulpit to tell us that war purifies the world.—“Daily Mirror,” January 26th, 1920.

How wise are we becoming now, and how bold! What attitude did the writer of the above take up three years ago when the young working men were being “trained to brutality and violence,” and when vice was being made easy and as “safe” as can be for “our” glorious troops? Then everything done by “us” was right, and any man who dared to speak to the contrary was pro-German and in eminent danger of being treated to a dose of “mailed fist argument. Now that these things are being brought home to the patriotic stay-at-homes they are beginning to squirm, and their henchmen in the Press are once again writing according to the signs of the times.

The evidence being given at the Industrial Court which is inquiring into the Dockers’ claim for a higher wage, and which, of course, is perfectly in order seeing that we, the workers, have been told so often by Lloyd George and his satellites that we were to have a “new world” on the cessation of hostilities, is exceedingly interesting. Take the following, for instance:

Mr. Bevin asked what, assuming a docker worked 44 hours a week, would be his present rate of earnings in Liverpool.

Witness (Sir Alfred Booth): £3 4s. 6d.

Do you really suggest that is a living wage?—Yes.

Could you maintain your family upon it?—No, I could not.

Is it right to ask a man to maintain himself on what you would not dream of maintaining yourself on?—It is not a question of what I ask him to live upon, but what economic conditions allow.—“Daily News,” February 13th, 1920.

How dare any man suggest that members of the master class try and live on such fabulous wealth! Why, the idea is preposterous! It would not be the price of one night out! But it is quite good enough for a wage-slave. Who now would be bold enough to tell us that there are not two classes in society? True, during the war they tried to kid us that we were one, but when the masters’ quarrel is over, then the class war reveals itself again in all its grim sordidness. Higher Wages? What? No, economic conditions will not permit of it. The bosses want their pound of flesh.

Why tinker with the system? Let us end it!

If we wanted to find evidence in support of the statement that the Labour Party is unworthy of the support of the working class the task would certainly not be a difficult one. Within the last few months that party has gained quite a number of ex-Liberals who, while professing sympathy toward the labour movement, are still staunch supporters of the capitalist system of society. A change of name after all matters little. Actions speak louder than words.

Only recently Lord Haldane informed us that “Labour has captured the heights,” whilst Liberalism is in the plain, from which one would gather that as Liberalism fell lower the office-seekers chances would rise correspondingly higher through the medium of a profession of Labour ideals.

How little a Labour government is to be feared can be instanced by the praise which is bestowed upon Labour officials in many quarters. A short while ago Lord Riddell was presiding at a Lecture given by Mr. T. E. Naylor on “Trade Unionism and Output,” and from a newspaper report I cull the following:

Paying a tribute to British trade union leaders, Lord Riddell said he would not fear a Labour Government.—“Daily News,” February 26th, 1920.

No, the Labour movement is not out to stop the robbery of the workers, but only to endeavour to increase the masters’ plunder. Support of that party means support for Rent, Interest, and Profit.

To-day’s headlines:—
Ideal Homes.

Public’s Last Chance to see them.

So ran an announcement in the “Star” (24.2.20). Yes, in spite of all the flowery talk about “a land fit for heroes,” and “better houses for the workers,” it would seem that with the closing of the above exhibition all opportunities of the workers obtaining even a glimpse (at 2s. a time) of the Ideal Home will have vanished into thin air. Strange, is it not, that the workers produce Ideal Homes and yet content themselves in hovels where the master class would not house their dumb animals.

THE SCOUT.

It behoves all members and friends to see that the circulation of the Party Organ is pushed to the utmost limits.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

SOME SOCIALIST PARTY!—Continued.

The peculiar “Socialism” which is propagated by the N.S.P. and similar organisations, is naturally misleading to the workers who are ignorant of the principles of Socialism, and also confusing to the few who have awakened to the fact of their exploitation and are seeking the only remedy for their misery. In most cases organisations of this type are formed for the express purpose of confusing the minds of the masses, and turning them from their only means of emancipation—Socialism. They are told by glib, plausible orators that the workers’ interests are really one with the interests of their exploiters the bourgeoisie, and that the antagonism which is felt toward the capitalists is one of the causes of the constant friction. If love could be fostered in the hearts of both workers and employers, peace on earth would be assured. It reminds me of the story of the lion lying down quietly with the lamb—the lamb inside the lion! Such nonsense brought forward by the N.S.P. points to an utter ignorance of social conditions. The defects of the present system are not due to the “selfishness” or “wickedness” of one class, or the “antagonism” of the other. These things are simply the direct results of a system rotten to the core. Therefore it should be obvious to everybody that if the present system be abolished and another put in its place, a system formed for the benefit of the whole of society, instead of for a favoured few, as is that existing to-day, to the detriment of the rest of society, the effects of a defective society, i.e., “selfishness,” “wickedness,” “class antagonism,” etc., will pass away.

Since Socialism is the only solution to the working-class “problem” the working class must make an effort to understand the means whereby such a system of society can be brought about. Practically the whole political power lies in the hands of the working class. By voting the capitalist candidates into Parliament year after year the workers are giving their exploiters the opportunity to perpetuate this system of wage-slavery. When the former have become conscious of their slave position, and have discovered that Socialism is the only remedy for their ills, they will vote a Socialist majority into Parliament. In this way will the capitalists be shorn of the power (the Army, Navy, and Police) which enables them to protect their selfish interests.

The hope of the workers lies in the study of this matter. The principles and means of attaining Socialism must become so firmly rooted in their minds that all the plausible vapourings of the N.S.P. and like organisations, falling upon enlightened hearers, will fail to have the effect these misleaders desire. J. C.

OUR £1,000 FUND.

Below we present the Fourteenth Honours List in connection with our Thousand Pounds Fund. Considering that we are informed that some 240 people in this country have made two hundred million, we are not getting very fast. There seems to be a certain deplorable shyness abroad among those who hunger and thirsteth after Socialism which passeth our understanding and resists all our efforts to cure. Few indeed have acquired the monthly habit, yet it is a most desirable habit to possess. Not one has had the goodness to make a will in our favour and kick the bucket. We have not room for further suggestions, but remind you that anything you may send us is safe from excess profits tax, capital levy, and amusement tax.

FOURTEENTH LIST.

Already acknowledged	£446 10 11½
A few sympathisers of the Licensed Vehicle Workers, per E. Fairbrother	8 0 0
B 63, 6os.; F.F., 5s. (Hornsey)	3 5 0
F.J.H. (Hornsey) £1; F.J. (Hornsey) 3s.	1 3 0
E.B. (B.E.A.)	18 9
Wm. Howard (Stoke Newington)	1 0 0
Thomas Bugg (Wood Green)	12 0
D. Gerber (London)	10 0
A.S. 10s.; L.S. 10s.	1 0 0
P. Buckingham, 10s.; N. Bishop, 3s.; J. Fitzgerald, 5s.	18 0
M. Walters, 5s.; “The Scout,” 5s.; M.A. B. (Fulham), 5s.; G.C.G. (Gun’sby) 5s.	1 0 0
Gallaher (Hanley)	7 0
F. Finney (Berkenhead)	5 0
Kett (W. Kilburn), 3s.; Joe White (Camberwell), 2s. 6d.; C. J. McLaren, 2s. 6d.	
King (Stoke Newington), 2s. 6d.; C. W. Christie (Clydebank), 2s. 6d.; Anon (Exeter), 2s. 2d.; W. Hamp, 2s.; McF. (Wood Green) 2s.; A. Lyle (Swansea), 1s.; J. Slabbs (Wood Green), 1s.; G. McKenzie (Glasgow) 1s.; A.G.W. (Wood Green) 6d.	1 2 8
Collected at meeting of “Hobboes”	3 5
Tottenham, per F.F., £4 1s. 7½d., per J.C., 10s., per J.S., £1 14s. 3d.; S.T., per W.S., 11s. 6d.	6 17 4½
Battesea, £2 15s.; per Craske (253), 10s., per Banks (279) 10s.; per Cliburn (254), 6s., per Edwards (270), £1 0s. 6d.	5 1 6
N.W. London Br., £3; J. Mills, do. £1 7s.	4 7 0
Edmonton, per F.H., £2 5s., per R. Temple (285), 10s., per Mansfield, 3s. 9d.	2 18 9
Manchester per T. McCarthy (317) £1; per A. Webster (316), 12s.; per A. L. Myerson, £1 5s. 1d.	2 17 1
Wood Green, £1; per Penny (312), £1 1s. 6d.; W.C., per Gillham, 10s.	2 11 6
Islington, £1; per Fletcher (290) 7s. 6d.	1 7 6
West Ham, A.B.D. (227), 5s.; King (231) 4s.; L.H.D., 2s. 6d.; G.R.A., 2s.; G.T. 2s.	1 3 0
Tooting Branch	1 0 6

£495 0 0

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Mattheu-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 74 Murdock-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Com'tee. Applications to General Secy.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142 Bulwar-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., 70 New-castle-st., Hulme, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Exmouth-St. Schools (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High-rd., Willesden-green, N.W.10.

SOUTHEND ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy, J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Secy., 207 Derinton-rd., Tooting, S.W.

TOTTENHAM.—Secy. C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd.'s. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 51 Greenleaf-rd., Walthamstow. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., alternate Mondays from March 8th. Visitors invited.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Mondays at Upton Cross Schools, Plas'et-rd., Upton Manor. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS FOR MARCH.**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.
Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 154 High St.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 188. Vol. 16.]

LONDON, APRIL, 1920.

[MONTHLY, TWO PENCE

PARLIAMENT OR SOVIET?

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION.

The self-styled left wing of the so-called Socialist and Labour movement of Great Britain has for some time past been debating the topic of the Soviet as opposed to Parliament as the means of securing the "dictatorship of the proletariat."

The Bone
of
Contention.

Just as the right wing of the reformist Labour Party has condemned the Soviet as an anti-Socialist institution, so the left wing Anarchists (for in practice that is what they are) have gone to the other extreme and proclaimed the Soviet as the *only* means of realising Socialism! What has the Socialist Party of Great Britain to say on the matter? The answer is implicit in its declaration of principles.

"The working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government."

In the "Communist Manifesto" Marx and Engels clearly stated that the form of application of Communist principles would vary according to the degree of development, industrial and political, reached in various countries. It is equally absurd, therefore, to condemn or uphold the Soviet system irrespective of the conditions out of which it arose.

In Russia the Soviets arose spontaneously in opposition to the Tsarist (and later the Bourgeois) dictatorship. Parliament had never been the supreme power in the State because the bulk of the population had never been industrially concentrated and politically organised. Local councils acting independently to a large extent, and at most never realising the need for more than

The
Soviet
Seed-Bed.

federal unity, were, therefore, the natural expression of popular opinion. In adopting the Soviet constitution, therefore, the Bolsheviks

did not invent a system: they accepted a fact! Their attempt to convoke a central assembly representative of the mass of the people had failed, as it was bound to fail, in a welter of illiteracy and disorganisation.

An
Of-forgotten
Point.

The point is often missed that it was not only the Bolshevik Party which was in a minority. The whole of the political parties in the Assembly put together were!

Had that not been the case it is difficult to understand the ease with which the Assembly was suppressed. Contrast this state of affairs with that obtaining in the Western "democracies." For generations the working class has been in the habit of supporting capitalist parties, and for a still longer period these parties have been controlling, through Parliament, the machinery of Government. Soviets simply do not exist except in the fevered imaginations of the "left-wingers." Some of the latter indeed appear to regard the Trades Councils, etc., as incipient Soviets, but the value of these bodies for the purpose of establishing Socialism is, to say the least, obscure, and the more "advanced" Soviets are opposed to anything short of industrial unions with a programme of "equal wages." But the central factor of the political situation, i.e., the armed force of society, is not controlled by either trades council or industrial union. It is controlled by Parliament. Parliament represents the powers of government, and not till it ceases to do so will the necessity for capturing it disappear. This much is obvious.

The
Central
Factor.

The Sovietites, of course, trust to a revolt of the army against Parliament; but such a revolt would be unnecessary if revolutionists were in

a majority therein, and it would be futile (and in the highest degree unlikely) if they were not. The army cannot establish Socialism. That must be done by the mass of society, the working class, who possess the majority of the votes for the public bodies, national and local, and can therefore convert those bodies into revolutionary agencies whenever they choose to do so. Before the army can come over to the workers it must have something to come over to! Some alternative to the existing social order must be immediately practicable. In other words the workers must be consciously and politically organised for Socialism. This requires incessant propagandist effort of an educational character. Not mere inflammatory sentiments but illuminating science is necessary.

But this is not what the Sovietites supply. One surveys the field of their practical activities only to perceive a desperate state of confusion. Thus the B.S.P., alleging its adherence to the "third international," remains part of the Labour Party, which belongs to the second! Declaring for Soviets, it nevertheless continues Parliamentary methods, presumably for self-advertisement sake and to provide scope for its adventures.

The S.L.P. attacks the B.S.P. theoretically for inconsistency, but in practice never tires of trying to come to a working arrangement with it. Likewise the W.S.F. which pretends to oppose any form of parliamentary action as anti-Socialist. Opportunists all, they cannot do without their immediate demands, to be realized indiscriminately by legislation or the general strike, they are never clear or united as to which. Swearing by the Revolution, they yet cannot trust it as the all-sufficient and supreme programme. Like the avowed reformers they denounce, they must be "practical"; must always "talk down" to ignorance. Exactitude they deplore as "pedantry"; consistency they regard as "inadaptability." The Socialist Party, however, is prepared to go on with its work knowing that events will prove its attitude to be the correct one.

Capitalism may develop, but its basis and essential character remain the same. The principles, therefore, which are deduced from that basis and serve as a guide to working-class action remain unchanged. As for the application of those principles, in the words of Marx: "The more highly developed country holds up to the less developed the mirror of its own future." It is not, therefore, a question of us following Russia, but it will be a question of Russia having to follow us. The S.F.G.B. never had to leave the Second International: it was never in it! Representing working-class interests, it is hostile to every other party.

Only on such lines can Socialism be realised. All power to the workers—through the Socialist Party! E. B.

MASTERMAN'S MUDDLE.

"The Globe" on February 6th, 18th, and 23rd published a series of articles by Mr. C. F. G. Masterman entitled "The Failure of Class War," a premature verdict delivered while the manifestations of class antagonism become more apparent daily.

"Marx," says Mr. Masterman, "prophesied that all the means of production would pass into the hands of a small company of rich men. They would squeeze down the wages of the poor to the limits of subsistence. The poor, fighting against each other for the bare means of living, would possess nothing and become the mere wage-slaves of the rich. After a time of unspeakable misery these many poor would rise against the few rich in a 'class war,' destroy them, take over their property, and establish a communist state."

Much that Mr. Masterman afterwards writes goes far to prove that this "prophesy" of Marx is well on its way toward fulfillment. When he says later on "The power of capital concentrated in the hands of a few is far too tremendous," and when we find throughout his articles that he does not attempt to deny that the bulk of society—the working class—are wage-slaves, and that the majority of them live in "unspeakable misery," we can only conclude that he accepts these things as part and parcel of the system—necessary evils that may vary in magnitude but must always be.

Our author does not deny that the workers—as in the time of Marx—compete with each other on the labour market for the sale of their labour-power, the result being that their wages are "squeezed down" to the level that just enables them to go on producing for their masters. What he really does is to assert that to-day there are more people living in comfort than ever before. Professor Marshall in his "Economics of Industry," tries, through long, dreary pages of platitudes and repetitions, to defend the capitalist system on the same grounds. But what consolation is it to the dispossessed working-class to know that the number of parasites living by their exploitation has increased? Does the fact that 340,000 men made over four thousand million pounds during the war, bring any satisfaction to the thirty-odd millions of the population who belong to the working class and have to keep up a constant struggle against the masters in order to obtain a "minimum wage."

Mr. Masterman says that "Marx was utterly

wrong in his prophesy. He did not foresee the coming power of the trade unions. . . or the interference of the government to raise wages to a minimum." Marx understood the power of trade unions—and the limits of their power—only too well. And Mr. Masterman pays him a well-deserved tribute when he points out the fact that trade unions have failed to raise wages to "a minimum"—what-over that mean—without assistance from the government.

It is perfectly true that Parliament—although merely an executive of the capitalist class—spends much of its time framing laws to protect the workers from the ever-increasing rapacity of capitalists. This policy has been followed, more or less consistently, ever since the first Factory Act was passed, not from any goodwill toward the workers, but solely because the preservation of some sort of order is an imperative of any social order. Without restraint, exercised by the executive government, capitalism would quickly become a wild orgy of ruthless exploitation.

In pursuance of the same idea Mr. Masterman says that "In America most of the very rich men started from the bottom." But even if this is true it does not palliate the conditions of the bulk of American society, who still remain at the bottom.

In Britain, we are told, "The small farmers classes are disappearing through the losses and taxes of the war. The small farmers and small holders are buying their farms and holdings. They are becoming well off. They are becoming capitalists. They cannot understand the 'class war' theory. It does not apply to them." But Mr. Masterman has told them now: they are becoming capitalists; that is why it does not apply to them. It is between the working class and the capitalist class that the class war must be waged, not between capitalists and capitalists. This should be obvious to the dullest of Mr. Masterman's readers.

Moreover, what if America's richest men did start from the bottom? Their rise has been effected by the robbery of the working class, who are still at the bottom. It matters nothing to the working class how the personnel of the ruling class changes. Our author's point is pointless, because the Socialist declares that there exists antagonism of interests between exploiters and exploited, while he replies that there is no antagonism, therefore no class war, between capitalists and capitalists. We already knew that: the capitalists are fully occupied fighting the working class.

There is nothing new about Mr. Masterman's criticisms; he has merely adopted the freak

arguments that were exploded by Marx himself, and which are easily dealt with by Socialists to-day. For instance, he contends that the ownership of capital is the result of work and saving; but it is the working class that do all the work, and by virtue of the fact that they only consume such wealth as is necessary to maintain their continued efficiency, are the only class that save. From the total wealth produced by the workers wages are paid. The remainder constitutes the fund from which new capital is saved. The whole of this fund is owned by capitalists, who use it either to satisfy their needs and fancies, or as fresh capital—in other words, for the further exploitation of the workers. Thus the working class only get what slave classes have always had—all the work and just sufficient of the necessities of life to enable them to go on working.

Again, Mr. Masterman tries to show that the workers themselves are capitalists because of their funds in savings banks, trade unions, etc. He does not compare the few millions owned in this way with the thousands of millions owned by capitalists, nor does he acknowledge that these funds are practically the total savings of thirty-eight millions of the population to provide against unemployment and capitalist oppression generally. Instead, he quotes the railwaymen as investing their funds in railway stock, thus handing over to their enemies the funds they had built up to fight them with.

But Mr. Masterman has no delusions about co-operative stores. He says: "Co-operatives cannot attack capitalism. 'Divi' is the interest on capital." The strange thing is that our author cannot see, or pretends not to see, that "divi" is the capitalist's only object, and, therefore, that wealth can only be called capital when it obtains "divi," or profits, for its owner. He sees it quickly enough, however, in the worker who takes up a few shares in a co-operative store for the sake of a few paltry shillings a quarter.

"Capital," says Mr. Masterman, "is the houses we live in, the factories in which we make clothes, and ship, and machines; the food we store up from one harvest to another; the ploughs and harrows and spades that enable us to produce a harvest at all." Some of these things, it is true, are capital; but not because of any quality they possess in themselves as means for producing further wealth, but because they are owned by the master class exclusively, and can only be used by the working class on the condition that all the wealth they produce belongs to the capitalist class.

Mr. Masterman's remedy is, in his own words, "to make all men capitalists": a remedy that is

BY THE WAY.

just about as idiotic as that which used to be imputed to the Socialist—finding up all the wealth. It would not then be a question of "who would do the dirty work," but who would do any work at all, because capitalists do not work, they live on "div"—the surplus-value produced by the workers divided amongst them in the form of rent, interest, and profit.

Mr. Masterman's attack on Socialism is largely made up of apologies for the most pronounced evils of capitalism. He says: "The money spent or wasted on luxury by the rich, if saved, would make very little difference to the total income to be divided." Of course not: it is "spent or wasted" after it has been divided, after the workers have received their share—wages—which can never rise much above the cost of living. The irony of the worker's position is that the more wealth that is wasted by the capitalists the more work there is for him, the less competition there is for jobs, and the greater is the possibility of higher wages. But our author, failing to perceive the merchandise character of human labour-power, fails to see the natural results of that status. But that is not the only instance of his blindness. He says: "most of the money going now to men of great fortune is not spent but saved." Seeing that they already have great fortunes very little credit is due to them for their abstention. Oh, but, interjects our friend, "at death the State gets a big slice of it, and the rest is generally distributed among many others." The point Mr. Masterman does not (want to) see is that it never goes back to the working class, who produce it.

Mr. Masterman introduces his subject with the declaration: "It is no good going out fighting against empty abstractions; battle with words. You can't destroy giant evils with words." From the capitalist standpoint Socialism is a "giant evil," that is why he sets out to destroy it—with words. Like so many others who have tried, he fails because he represents neither capitalism nor Socialism faithfully. He never examines the basis of capitalism because, for him, it is the best possible system. It divides society into a privileged and a slave class, and his lot is cast among the privileged. Socialism is repugnant to him because it would abolish slavery and privilege and establish society on a basis where the means of wealth-production, instead of being owned by a small capitalist class, would be the common property of society, to be used for the needs of a community making arrangements for production and distribution according to a settled plan agreed upon by all, a system based upon common ownership and democratic control of all the means of life.

F. F.

In the days of long ago we were accustomed to hear that "Socialism would break up the family life," but with the world warring it soon became manifest that the sending of working men to participate in the masters' quarrel was a more potent factor for achieving that object. While the men of England were "crushing the German military machine" and making the world safe for democracy and "our women," later results would seem to show that there are Huns in other places than Germany. A study of the Press would soon clinch the point.

With the Bolshevik rebellion in Russia the antis here soon got to work and a new cry was taken up by them. For the benefit of those folk who put their thinking out to be done for them, like they do their dirty linen, the story was told and re-told of how the Bolsheviks "nationalised" their women, and other lying statements were made in order to throw dust in the eyes of the working people here. Yet at the same time in Christian England we speak of "public women" and on contents bills of local newspapers the line "The Social Evil" meets our eye week after week. Verily our masters are a gang of hypocrites.

Now we read of an astounding proposition emanating from the land of "our gallant ally," France. I will quote the announcement in full. Here it is:

A daring proposal for increasing the birth-rate in France is made in the "Paris Medical," by M. Paul Carnot, Professor of Therapeutics at the Faculty of Medicine at Paris University. He says that if the birth-rate in France is not considerably increased in a few years France's losses of 2,000,000 men in the war will have been quadrupled.

Discussing the methods by which maternity could be made a remunerative career for women, he asks whether society should not confide the mission of increasing the population to a large number of "volunteers of maternity," the community bearing the expense of rearing children and giving bonuses in respect of healthy offspring.

—"Daily News," March 26th, 1920.

Doubtless the master class have it in mind that, in order to maintain their system, wage-slaves and an armed force are necessary, and though the war just terminated was to be the last war, signs are not wanting that those who uttered such puerile twaddle so short a while ago were gravely in error or deliberately "kidding" the simple ones. Hence the necessity for preparedness for future eventualities, and thus the need for "volunteers of maternity." What will the antis say now?

We have all heard at some time or other that if we were careful, industrious, thrifty, god-

fearing, and abstained from Bacchanalian orgies the ladder was clear and easy of access for every one of us to climb to fame and wealth. Have we not heard of this man and that who started life in humble surroundings and, by practising the virtues enumerated above, ultimately became what our false teachers call "self made men"? Most workers now realise that to be born in the ranks of the working class means being doomed to remain there until the end of their days.

For the benefit of those who accept the dictum that we all have an equal opportunity of rising to the pinnacle portrayed by these misleaders, the following taken from the Inland Revenue Department and quoted in an article in "Reynolds's Newspaper" (28.3.20.) should afford some enlightenment:

- (1) 340,000 persons added £2,846,000,000 to their fortunes.
- (2) 180 persons added an average of £700,000 to their fortunes (total wealth) between the outbreak of war and June 30th, 1919.
- (3) 200 persons added an average increase of £320,000 each to their fortunes.
- (4) 564 added an average of £230,000 each to their fortunes.
- (5) The remaining 44,500,000 being all those who were worth less than £5,000 on June 30, 1919, added £1,334,000,000 to their fortunes. Just less than one-half of the increase of wealth belonging to the favoured half-million.

No, the road to affluence and power is not through grinding toil.

The oneness of the international master class has just recently been illustrated. How beautifully humane they are in their treatment of their slaves. From a report dealing with the revolt on the part of the German workers I take the following extract:

Fighting continues in most of the thickly populated areas, and has been particularly severe in the Rhineland and at Leipzig, where the workers shot down a military aeroplane after bombs had been dropped on the city.

—"Daily News," March 20th, 1920.

It matters not what part of the capitalist world one looks at to observe the fact that whenever a revolt on the part of the workers takes place it is always met with the armed forces of capitalist society. When will the workers learn the lesson from the past and understand their position in society, then organise to overthrow the system that robs them of the fruit of their labours. "Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains, you have a world to win!"

On more than one occasion lately Mr. Lloyd George has told those who read his speeches

that there is growing up in this country a movement which means to put an end to the capitalist system. To counteract this movement he desires a fusion of the different political parties he thinks that by this method he can give an extended lease of life to his capitalist paymasters. The puny efforts of this political mountebank are only to be likened to Mrs. Partington endeavouring with her broom to stay the incoming tide.

Strange, is it not, that this individual who was so loud in his condemnation of capitalist society from 1906 to 1910 should now be so keen in endeavouring to maintain that system, which he said at Swansea on October 1st, 1908, "No one can really honestly defend."

Perhaps in view of the foregoing paragraph a few extracts from that speech would not be amiss. Indeed, it may be helpful to those who as yet only see as through a glass darkly. In that speech Lld. George himself states part of the indictment against capitalism and furnishes the Socialist with ammunition to help him in storming the capitalist citadel. Let me quote:

There are 43 millions of people in this country. They are not here of their own choice. Whether they are here by accident or by the direct decree of Providence, at any rate they have had no control or voice in the selection of the land of their birth. If hundreds and thousands of them either starved, or were on the brink of starvation, we must not blame Providence for this misfortune. There are abundant material resources in this country to feed, clothe, and shelter them all—yea, and if properly husbanded and managed to do the same for many millions more.

Speaking of the callous indifference of the capitalist class he says:

We are still confronted with the more gigantic task of dealing with the rest—the sick, the infirm, the unemployed, the widows, and the orphans. No country can lay any real claim to civilisation that allows them to starve. Starvation is a punishment that society has ceased to inflict for centuries on its worst criminals, and at its most barbarous stage humanity never starved the children of the criminal.

But what happens to-day. . . A workman breaks down in his prime, and permanently loses his power of earning a livelihood. . . Why should he be allowed to starve and his children to die of hunger in this land of superabundant plenty?

Another quotation from the same source taken from the right honourable gentleman's speech at Newcastle, on October 9th, 1909, is particularly appropriate at this juncture. In fact, were he to refresh his memory once again and give utterance to his former speeches, one could imagine the cry of "Bolshevik" escaping from the lips of his patriotic supporters. In the speech referred to he asked a series of questions, as follows:

Who ordained that a few should have the land of Britain as a perquisite? Who made ten thousand people owners of the soil, and the rest of us trespassers in the land of our birth? Who is it who is responsible for the scheme of things whereby one man is engaged through life in grinding labour to win a bare and precarious existence for himself . . . and another man who does not toil receives every hour of the day, every hour of the night, whilst he slumbers, more than his poor neighbour receives in a whole year of toil? (Extracts from "Better Times," by D. Ld. George.)

Now this was the position of the workers fourteen years ago when Ld. George and the Liberal Party came into office—then he was going to lead us to the "fields of waving corn." At that period he stated—"If at the end of an average term of office it were found that a Liberal Parliament had done nothing to cope seriously with the social condition of the people, to remove the national degradation of slums and wide-spread poverty and destitution in a land glittering with wealth. . . then would a real cry arise in this land for a new party."

Fourteen months ago the same gentleman, having won the war, came along with his Coalition Party and his "New World" stunt. Again he glibly talked about a "land fit for heroes," and his reform-mongering panacea for all our social ills. Surely the time has arrived when he should be judged by the test he himself laid down fourteen years ago. Let the workers themselves ask and answer the question—Has Lloyd George and his Government done anything to cope seriously with the social condition of the people, the poverty and destitution? Then, I think, they will bring in a verdict that capitalism has been found guilty, and that the next thing to do is to pronounce sentence of death and usher in the Socialist Commonwealth.

It is extremely interesting to read the pronouncements of the men of God. Just recently Cardinal Bourne, in his Lenten pastoral, declared, according to the "Illustrated Sunday Herald" (15.2.1920), that "through the terrible scourge of the war God has wrought a real improvement in His People. Evils such as prodigal expenditure and unrestrained luxury were the outcome of the unreasoning restlessness which has always followed a terrible conflict. But deeper down one saw a more genuine desire in all classes to see justice done to those who in the past had been exposed to poverty, pauperism, and desolate old age."

Really the follower of the lowly Nazarene must have had his rose-coloured spectacles on to observe the things he portrays. Where, might I ask, is the "real improvement to be found? True we have read of the millionaire who has found "real improvement," and who

exclaimed "What is the use of having a war if you do not make anything out of it?" But generally speaking, from a working-class point of view, no improvement is discernable.

As to the statement that "deeper down one saw a more genuine desire to see justice done to those who had been exposed to poverty, pauperism, and desolate old age," that, to put it mildly, is a terminological inexactitude. The bitter struggle which ensues when these people endeavour to obtain an increase of wages or pension to keep pace with the ever-increasing cost of living gives the lie direct to those Holy Joes who prate about "genuine desires."

In the days long ago when I used to attend Divine Worship one heard a great deal about the gospel of Christ being a gospel of peace and goodwill towards men. Maybe this was a good stunt for Sunday, intended to be put away in the drawer with the Sunday clothes. During the war period we are all aware that notwithstanding the lip-service given to this glorious gospel of "peace" by the ambassadors of Christ, they were, in the main, whole-hearted supporters of war to the bitter end, and, to the last drop of somebody else's blood. Even now that our masters have arranged a kind of patched-up peace they want to be preparing for the next war. Witness the following:

At the morning and evening services at the Waltham Abbey Baptist Church yesterday the congregations passed resolutions declaring that the closing of the Royal Gunpowder Factory would have a disastrous effect upon the town and neighbourhood, and calling upon the Prime Minister to intervene to save the factory and thus avert the spread of unemployment.—"Daily News," March 1st, 1920.

Here you have the glories of Christianity and capitalism. On Sunday you have the local tin-Bethelites forgoing their ostensible for worship and preparation for the "next world," but the uncertainty of an existence in this apparently troubles them more. They have their eyes firmly fixed on the main chance. What damned hypocrisy!

At one time we heard a lot about the lofty ideals of the Allies—that they did not enter the war for self-aggrandisement or gain; no, simply to crush Prussian militarism and make the world safe for democracy. How successful they have been even an individual with one eye can perceive. From time to time quite a number of little differences have arisen among these would-be saviours of the universe over the division of the spoils. Take this as a recent example:

In shipping circles the decision of the Supreme

Council with regard to the allocation of German tonnage among the Allies is being awaited with some anxiety. The council is to deal with the thorny question this week. France is going to fight against the plan that each Ally should be allowed to retain all the ships captured or interned in that Ally's ports during the war. Under this plan America would retain 50 per cent. more German tonnage than she lost. France would suffer in comparison, but so would this country, although much bitter French criticism is directed against us. France, if it is asserted, will decline to hand back the 250,000 tons allocated provisionally for her use, in addition to her final share in the restricted pool, so that an amicable solution seems difficult of attainment.—"Reynolds's," March 21st, 1920.

Another interesting piece of information was vouchsafed to us by the daily Press a few days ago. It concerns the question of "our mandate" for Mesopotamia, and it runs thus:

Mr. Lloyd George has stated that the reason why we are extending our frontiers to include the distant province of Mosul is that "Mosul is a country with great possibilities. It has rich oil deposits."—"Daily News," March 29th, 1920.

Of course we are not told who are going to work these rich oil-fields or who will receive the dividends arising therefrom. But it is perfectly obvious that all the benefits to be derived therefrom will accrue to Lloyd George's paymasters, the capitalists. Working men laid down their lives to make this secure for their masters.

While we are exhorted to work, and work harder, to increase production, I note that a "vote as a grant-in-aid of the mission of the Prince of Wales to Australia and New Zealand is fixed so as not to exceed £20,000." A holiday for the parasites of society while the only useful class toils on to maintain them in luxury. When will the workers awake and end the system which robs them of the fruits of their toil?

THE SCOUR.

Don't forget that much of the value and efficacy of our activities depend upon that £1,000 Fund. Save your breeches by sending us your money before it burns your pockets out.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

PEACE PROBLEMS.—Continued.

tion side by side with private ownership, that we have poverty-stricken workers and idlers rolling in wealth.

The solution to the "problem" rests with the working class, who must get to understand their class position in society and enrol themselves in a political party with the object of capturing the powers of government, in order to establish Socialism. That political party already exists—it is the Socialist Party of Great Britain. Study the Object and Principles of that Party—they will be found on the last page of this paper—and if you agree with them come and join us, and fight for the only thing worth while, i.e., Socialism.

O. C. I.

THE THIEVES' KITCHEN RECORDS.

There has been a very fat month in the Thieves' Kitchen, and the debates, centring largely round matters of finance, offer nothing of sufficient interest to find place in these records. The Oral Answers, however, provide some food for reflection, as they usually do.

On March 20th Mr. Gwynne asked the First Lord of the Admiralty whether he is aware that the father of A. Judge, able seaman, H.M.S. "Vectis," sent a telegram on the 7th March to the Admiralty asking them to transmit a message to him of his mother's death; that no reply was received until the 11th March, and then to the effect that the Admiralty were unable to forward private messages to naval ratings at public expense."

The Minister admitted the truth of the facts implied in the question, which is surely a sign that the war is over. How short a period is it since nothing was too good (on paper and flag days) for "our heroic watchers of the deep"! And now our bosses candidly admit that they are too parsimonious to spare a few coppers to tell one of the Jack Cornwalls that his mother was dead!

Another answer to which attention might be directed is that given to the Member for Clitheroe, who asked the Under-Secretary for foreign affairs whether he was aware that the bodies of seven murdered Jews had been found in a forest in Hungary. The answer he got was that if the facts were as alleged there was no call for the Government to interfere.

But suppose that such an allegation had been made against the Bolsheviks, what would have been the tone of the reply? One calls to mind how much slenderer excuse served to make war upon the Dutch Republics of South Africa at the end of last century.—A. E. J.

ledged by all, and William II. employed them to farm the revenues of vacant sees, while barons often employed them as stewards of their estates. They were also the leading, if not the only, capitalists of that time, and must have assisted merchants considerably in their enterprises, though only upon a heavy commission. After the death of Henry I., the security which they had enjoyed was much weakened, in proportion as the royal power declined in the civil wars, and in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries they were in a precarious position. Stephen and Matilda openly robbed them, Henry II. (in 1137) demanded one fourth of their chattels, and Richard I. obtained large sums from them for his crusading extravagance. From 1144 to 1189 riots directed against them became common, and the Jewries of many towns were pillaged. In 1194 Richard I. placed their commercial transactions more thoroughly under local officers of the Crown. John exploited them to great advantage, and levied heavy tallages upon them, and Henry III. did very much the same. They were expelled from the kingdom in 1290, and before this had greatly sunk from their previous position as the financiers of the Crown to that of petty money-lenders to the poor at gross usury."—"Industry in England," pp. 103-4.

Such was the fate of an economically important class that was excluded from political power—material for the wielders of the supreme power to prey upon.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the Italian bankers grew powerful.

"Between 1297 and 1330 the country developed steadily in spite of the troubled times of Edward II. The Italian bankers grew more and more powerful and rendered increasingly important services to the Crown. The tin mines, the parliamentary grants, and the customs were constantly farmed out to them."—"The Financing of the Hundred Years War," Schuyler B. Terry, p. xviii.

The English woollen manufacturers were opposed to the Italians, partly because the latter were getting control of the wool trade, and partly on account of the debts they owed the Italians. When the latter had served the purpose of Edward III., the English monarch repudiated his debts and withdrew his support. Consequently they could not collect the other debts owing, as they had no power to enforce payment. The result was that they got into difficulties and eventually failed. After Edward's support had been withdrawn they suffered from the persecution of the English merchants, and were confined in the Tower of London and other prisons for various periods.

Their economic "power" had proved a sorry weapon when they had no political force to back them.

From the foregoing it will be seen that economic "power" is a myth until political supremacy is attained. Correctly speaking, "economic power" as defined by the misguided Industrial Actionists, is a figment of the imagination. The ideas and conclusions derived from the phrase are the result of a complete failure to digest the lessons hammered home by history.

The employing class of to-day do not rule because they have possession of the means of production, but conversely, they have possession of the means of production because they rule. The employer who spends his time wandering over the globe cannot retain possession of the wealth produced merely through the legal form—the legal form must have the power behind it, the power that enforces acceptance of the existing legal paraphernalia; and wild words, empty stomachs, or brickbats, are not effective combating forces.

Capitalist private property differs from all previous forms of private property, particularly in its present highly developed form. The capitalist of the present day does not privately own a factory, a mine, or a mill. He owns a number of shares in several mammoth corporations. The handling of the whole business of these corporations—even to the buying and selling of the shares—is in the hands of individuals receiving wages, or, in the case of the more dignified but none the less oppressed, salaries. In other words, the whole of the business is conducted by wage slaves. The function of the capitalist is, generally speaking, restricted to the spending of the continually increasing bank balance.

This illustrates the fact that, at the present time the working, or wage-slave, class is the most important economic class in society. Yet in spite of this the capitalist lives like a parasite on the industry that is run by others. The only way a useless class, divorced from production, can do this is by having supreme power, and the supreme power is the governmental machinery.

Therefore it is necessary to wrest from them the only power they possess. The only way this can be done is by the workers organising politically for the capture of political power, which is centred in the Parliamentary machinery.

"Economic power" is but another of the delusions and shadows the workers must clear out of their heads, along with the other cobwebs, in the march to emancipation.

GILMAN.

LIGHTS OF OTHER DAYS.

"THE PIONEERS OF LAND REFORM" with an introduction by M. Beer, author of "A History of British Socialism." London: Bell & Sons, Ltd. Bohn's Popular Library. Social Economic Section.

The above work comprises three essays; the first, "The Real Rights of Man," by Thomas Spence, published in 1793; the second, "An Essay on the Right of Property in Land," by William Ogilvie, 1789; the third: "Agrarian Justice," Thomas Paine, 1795-6.

Messrs Bell are to be complimented on the tasteful manner in which they have presented these three essays to the public interested in social studies. The volume is a handy size, artistically bound, with clear type on a good paper, and is sold at a reasonable price—a combination not often achieved in the publishing world to-day.

The essays themselves are well worth preserving if only because they exhibit the social problem as it appeared to men of intelligence and sincerity before modern Socialism exposed the real nature of capitalism and revealed the futility of reform.

It was natural that men should see injustice in the extensive ownership of land before they observed the same injustice in the ownership of machines, mills, and other instruments of production. On page 6 Spence says: "It is plain that the land or earth, in any country or neighbourhood, with everything in or on the same, or pertaining thereto, belongs at all times to the living inhabitants of the said country or neighbourhood in an equal manner."

In his day capitalist industry had already reached the stage where, through division of labour, there were nearly always more workers on the labour market than were required in manufacture, the result being, as now, competition for jobs, which kept wages low. In addition, however, the assizes had the power to fix wages, so that, even when there was a demand for workers, wages could not rise above subsistence level.

These early fruits of the capitalist system—unemployment, low wages, and a general wretchedness of condition of the working class—were viewed by the "pioneers" from the standpoint of the prevailing notions of private property. Private property in land, or the means of wealth production, had, up till that time, not been questioned or challenged. The scientific age had only just begun. The stage where men analyse and sift the symptoms from the essentials, and discovering the cause of abnormal conditions to be fundamental, prescribe fundamental changes, had not been reached. Science was in its teens, feeling its

way toward maturity. And social science was the most backward of all, because men do not begin to investigate the basis of their relations with one another until scientific methods in other spheres have demonstrated the necessity for its application.

Spence and Ogilvie wrote when men still living could remember the later enclosures of land that followed the break-up of the Feudal system. They actually lived in the period often described as that of the industrial revolution—the second half of the eighteenth century—when machine industry had its birth. Thus their ideas naturally reverted to the conditions that had so recently been swept away. They asserted that only by laws which would give to every man the right to occupy land sufficient for his requirements could poverty be abolished. Ogilvie's essay on "The Rights of Property in Land" is an exhaustive and detailed plan for giving every man this privilege. Subsequent history has shown that such a plan would have been futile. Large capital outlay is just as necessary in agriculture to-day as in manufacture. The man who can neither buy nor hire machinery is a slave to the soil. The first bad harvest flings him into the grip of the money-lenders; and if he is lucky, after long days of drudgery and nights of anxiety he may be able to pay the interest and live as well as the artisan.

In most European countries a far greater proportion of the workers have been peasant-proprietors than in England, but it has not saved them from the poverty and wretchedness incidental to capitalism everywhere. The small holder cannot hope to compete with the big capitalists; their position becomes more precarious and their condition more wretched with every advance in machinery and large-scale production.

Tom Paine and Thomas Spence were something more than "pioneers of land reform." Paine is much better known for his splendid efforts against dogma and superstition. Spence was a leader in all working-class movements of his day against capitalist oppression. "He took part in all revolutionary movements, and was twice imprisoned, for altogether seventeen months," says Mr. Beer. In their day private ownership of land appeared to be the cause of poverty, because the worker had no means of living except by submitting to the manufacturers' conditions. In our day agriculture is not to be distinguished from any other subject of capitalist enterprise. Every industry has been capitalised, and is under the control of capitalists. The next step is the socialisation of industries and their control by the people.

F. F.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MANY QUESTIONS, CHIEFLY CONCERNING "ECONOMIC POWER"

To THE EDITOR.

Ardenvocht,
Woodstock Rd.,
Belfast.

Gentlemen.—For the past couple of years I have been interested in the Socialist movement, and have been a constant reader of the official organs of the different parties, particularly the Socialist Standard and the "Socialist" of the S.L.P.

I have not yet made up my mind which of the two parties (the S.P.G.B. or the S.L.P.) advocate the correct tactics to be adopted in order to usher in Socialism. There seems to be such a fog about the whole question of method that I will be much obliged if you will answer in a straight, clear, and satisfactory manner the following questions, taking each one separately.

1. Is it true that the master class control the armed forces solely through having political supremacy?

2. If the working classes sent a majority of Socialists to the House of Commons would that in itself give them control of the armed forces unless at the same time they had an Industrial Union to back up their political majority?

3. If you agree that Industrial Unionism is necessary as well as political action why do you disagree with the S.L.P.?

4. Is it not due to their control of the means of life on the industrial field that the master class control armed force, and if so, what use would a political majority be to the workers as long as the masters held the means of production in their hands?

5. Is it true that the military council override Parliament instead of vice versa, as witness, for instance, Churchill's expeditions, which were taken in hand without consulting the members of Parliament?

6. If class-conscious political action alone is necessary is it feasible to think that the master class are going to allow the workers to vote them out of power?

7. Is it necessary to wait for Socialism until the majority of people are class conscious?

8. What is your Party's opinion of the Russian Revolution and why did Kautsky of Germany and the Marxists of Russia oppose the Bolsheviks?

9. Does your Party agree that Lenin is a Marxist, and if not, why not?

10. Is it not a historical truth that economic power always preceded political power, and

why, therefore, does your Party not help on the advocacy of Industrial Unionism?

11. If through the big number of Socialists that may be returned to the House of Commons the masters suspend the Constitution, what can the workers do then unless they are industrially organised?

Hoping, gentlemen, that you will answer the above questions each in turn as I have asked them and as soon as possible.

I am faithfully yours,
SAMUEL SMITH.

OUR REPLY.

Regular readers of this paper will see at once how careless Mr. Smith has been in his reading of our columns, as most of the questions he asks have been answered therein during the period he mentions. Thus in the issues for January and February 1918 the front page articles cover a large portion of this ground. For the benefit of new readers it may be useful to deal with the points again.

1. Yes. There is no other way in which the capitalist class can control the armed forces. It is significant that those who try to belittle this important fact never attempt to show in what other way the capitalist class could exercise this control.

2. As it is by their majority in the House of Commons that the capitalists control these forces now, obviously a Socialist majority would control the same forces then. The Industrial Union—if it existed (and there is no ground for supposing that it will)—could not "back up" a political majority. On the contrary, the greatest efforts any union, industrial or other, could put forth could easily be crushed by that majority.

3. That any reader of the "S.S." should not be aware that we have opposed Industrial Unionism from its inception in 1905 seems almost impossible. Both the articles mentioned above and one given below answer this question.

4. What this question suggests is exactly the reverse of the truth. The masters are only able to retain their possession of the means of life because they control the armed forces through their political power. What is the first action of the masters when a big industrial dispute occurs? Is it to use their "economic power"? Not at all. The political machinery is set in motion and the armed forces are sent to protect the masters' property from being damaged, or taken hold of by the workers. Without this political power the capitalists' control of the means of life would vanish at the first move of the workers.

5. No. The Army Council derives all its authority from Parliament through the channel of the Cabinet. No expedition can take place without instructions from the Cabinet. This Cabinet is the executive committee of the majority in Parliament and can be turned out of office at any moment the majority decide to do so. In the present Parliament the majority have always agreed with these expeditions, and it is only a few individual members who have protested, and they have been outvoted each time by the majority.

6. It is quite possible to think that the master class will "allow" what they cannot prevent. When a sufficient number of workers decide to vote for Socialist candidates there will be a majority of those candidates returned to power. By this action the master class will be voted out, whether they like it or not.

7. "People" includes both classes in society—the capitalist class and the working class. It is only the latter class who are interested in establishing Socialism. A certain portion of this class are always more or less apathetic, and accept the actions of the active sections. A majority of this active section must be converted to Socialism—must become class-conscious—before the Revolution can take place.

8. Our opinion of the Russian "revolution" is to be found in the "S.S." for August, 1918 and February, 1919. In the latter issue is the article referred to above in answer to question 3, which gives complete proof of the anti-Socialist character and actions of the S.L.P.

When Kautsky and the "Russian Marxists," whoever they may be, publish their reasons for opposing Bolshevism we shall know why they did it.

9. Really, this is too thin, even from a Belfast man. It does not lie with us to prove a negative. Let those who assert that Lenin is a Marxist give their reasons for such assertion and we will deal with their case.

10. Economic "power" does not and cannot exist until political power is in the hands of the class concerned. Only when they have conquered this power are they able to control the means of life and the labour-power of others. As Industrial Unionism can neither supply this political power to the workers, nor defeat it when it is in the hands of the masters, to advocate it would be idiotic.

11. If the masters suspend the Constitution the workers may take one or more of the following courses:

- Start peaceful agitations and demonstrations against the suspension.
- Indulge in strikes to try to enforce the re-establishment of the Constitution.
- Form secret societies for the purpose of

using physical force against the masters.

The success or otherwise of the first two courses depends entirely upon the divisions in the ranks of the master class. If the minority of the masters against the suspension of the Constitution was fairly strong, either or both of these methods would stand a good chance of success. If the minority was small, then both methods would be useless. The masters could easily ignore the peaceful demonstrations—or forbid them being held—and crush any strike that might occur.

In these circumstances the workers could not be "industrially organised," because with the suspension of the Constitution the legal right of the workers to form combinations would be abolished.

There remains the method of secret societies. A small group, organised for a special, limited object, such as the assassination of a crowned head, may sometimes be successful, but it would be utterly impossible to organise the mass, or even the majority, of the workers into a secret society. Even the small groups are often failures, and the actual perpetrator hardly ever escapes.

Thus it is easily seen that this method is as useless as the other two.

But all this is based upon the IF. A serious student would not have asked such a question, but would first have inquired: "Can the master class suspend the Constitution?" This would have led to an examination of the Constitution, and then it would have been seen that the master class could only suspend the Constitution at the cost of the collapse of capitalism and the bringing in of chaos.

Capitalism has long outgrown the power of the capitalist class to manage all its activities. In production the capitalist has to employ special wage-slaves to organise his business, known as foremen and managers. In social affairs the complexity and area of the operations make it quite impossible for the capitalist class to manage the business, or even fill the offices required.

Hence thousands of functions have to be delegated to subsidiary bodies, as County Councils, Town Councils, etc., down to the little Parish Meeting. But this delegation of activities is necessarily based upon representation. Year by year the area of these delegated activities increases, and this increase compels an increase in the basis of representation—the Franchise. In every capitalist country this increase of the Franchise is steadily progressing, owing to the necessities of the system. In this country there has lately taken place a huge increase in the number entitled to use the Franchise.

Thus while persuading the workers to place

the centre of power—the Parliament—in the hands of the masters, these masters are compelled to place administration into the hands of elected bodies. To stop the activities of these bodies, while unable to carry them on themselves, would mean chaos and the collapse of capitalism.

The suspension of the Constitution would be a last act of despair on the part of that section of the master class who, Samson like, would endeavour to involve all in a common destruction. Even then it would fail of its ultimate purpose as the workers could, sooner or later, build up order out of chaos, though vast suffering and misery would ensue until that order had been accomplished. ED. COM.

PEACE PROBLEMS, PRICES AND PANICS.

For fear that the reader should imagine that I am going into a long diatribe about the capitalist peace I hasten to disillusion him. There can be no peace for the workers so long as capitalism exists, for wars are inevitable.

Wars are the outcome of an irreconcilable clash of interests manifest in the very nature of the capitalist system of society, wherein national groups of capitalists compete with one another in order to dominate the world's markets and trade routes. In their campaigns of conquest they drag in their train workers from all parts of the world, who are pitched and tossed like the gambler's coin to fight out the issue.

We have a glaring example in the recent world war—one of those periodical crises which shake society to its foundations and entail the sacrifice of millions of working-class lives.

The effects of the four and a half years war have set the ruling class of Europe trembling. For four and a half years the people have been engaged in the work of destruction. The blind passions of mankind have been aroused and inflamed by the cries of the capitalist class urging their wage slaves to slaughter one another.

Commencing with a propaganda of hate in the shape of the alleged German atrocities published as a blue book by the English Government. Following with the tirade against the "barbarous" methods of the German war lords—which methods were shown to be quite humane when practised by the Allied war lords.

There is a particular object in recalling to mind this propaganda of hate. We were told that the Germans would never be received or recognised by the rest of civilisation again. Now, however, the capitalists want peace, but

they find it a very difficult thing to obtain. The problems with which they are confronted are becoming truly terrifying to them, and as the "Daily Telegraph" (2.3.1920) puts it in an article on the findings of the Supreme Committee appointed by the Allies to deal with the economic problems of Europe:

"By some means or other the mounting prices of practically everything in everyday use, and food supplies in particular, must be checked."

Technically the war is over, but in fact it cannot be regarded as at an end until we have cleared up the complications which it created, and among these the rise in prices is the outstanding one."

Of course it is not surprising that while the energies of the capitalist class have been engaged for the past eighteen months at the Peace Conference in Paris in trying to come to some agreement among themselves as to the sharing of the spoils of the war, the problem of making up for the shortage of the necessities of life caused by years of concentrated destruction, has been somewhat neglected. The fact that prices of the necessities of life are high, and that many of them are practically unobtainable by the workers, that substitutes for our daily diet are looked upon as almost a matter of course, that the shortage of housing accommodation causes the workers to be so scandalously herded together, that there is unemployment amongst those who were never to know the pinch of poverty more—the demobilised soldiers—all these represent problems to the ruling class, and problems they are likely to remain.

It consoles the workers, however, to read about all these problems, because they still fondly imagine that their condition will be improved by listening to talk from the governing class. But that is as far as it will get. What concerns the allied capitalists of Europe at the present time is the vastly more important task of dividing up the territories taken from their late foes during the war, transferring the control of trade routes, etc. They find it a rather difficult matter, however, and this accounts for the utterance contained in the latter part of the quotation given above. But the last few words about the rise in prices being the outstanding complication are merely added as a blind—the complication being the "equitable" division of the spoils of war.

That our rulers hope some day to clear up their affairs with one another is to be gleaned from the following extract from the same authority. Here can be seen the anticipations they have for the future:

"Germany should receive her due quota of the available supplies in raw materials, provided the neutrals be willing to finance her imports

of this nature . . . with America standing out Germany's custom and business partnership, however distasteful, and righty distasteful, it may be to her war victims, become for Europe a disagreeable but compelling necessity."

The vile "Hun," with whom we would never trade again under any circumstances! The cant and cunning of the Allies' war cries are clearly shown in the above frank admissions.

The attempt to place the blame on America for "standing out" is a piece of camouflage artfully designed to hide their double dealing and justify their resumption of trade relations with their late enemies.

It must be borne in mind that the capitalist class of the world are united by common interests far more powerful than those which sometimes tend to tear them asunder. This point is convincingly illustrated by the fact that their guardians the Supreme Council have arrived at the following conclusion:

"Affirming the principle of International Solidarity, the necessity of Europe being treated in certain respects as a single economic entity . . . a general understanding has been reached by virtue of which Germany is to be helped by Europe to recover something of her pristine industrial productivity." (Same article in "Daily Telegraph.")

In the above can be seen how the masters realise the common interest of their class when they talk of International Solidarity. Territorial boundaries enable governments to explode different brands of patriotic gas to fool and divide the workers and create the necessary war enthusiasm. The workers, however, are referred to as fanatics, cranks, and bloody revolutionaries when they talk of Internationalism.

The writer finishes his article in thoughtful mood, remarking:

"Furthermore, far-seeing precautions must be taken lest we reproduce in these Islands, the worst evils which exist elsewhere. . . . War, famine, revolution, that is the sequence which the allies must arrest, if not for the sake of the peoples who were so recently their enemies, at least for their own salvation. . . . The principles of economy and self help in association with a spirit of co-operation and must be accepted by Europe as essential to recovery of economic health. None too soon the council has faced a problem which must be solved if the cancer which is consuming Northern Russia is not to spread far beyond the borders of that unhappy and distraught country."

This represents a heart-cry of the capitalists

of Europe. They realise the perilous position in which the result of four and a half years of war has placed them. Torn between conflicting emotions, on the one hand endeavouring without success for nearly two years to arrange among themselves the division of the spoils of war, and on the other hand their burning zeal to resume their commercial enterprises and trade relations, they are suffering the agonies of conscious impotence. Further, they are faced with the graver peril of the growing unrest of the working class of their respective territories.

The workers of the world would do well to examine the events of the last five years in relation to the attitude which this Party took up immediately on the outbreak of the war. In our manifesto published in the September 1914 issue of our Party Organ, we began by saying—

"Whereas the Capitalists of Europe have quarrelled over the question of the control of trade routes and the world's markets, and are endeavouring to exploit the political ignorance and blind passions of the working class of their respective countries in order to induce the said workers to take up arms in what is solely their masters' quarrel . . ."

and concluded with—

"Having no quarrel with the working class of any country, we extend to our fellow workers of all lands the expression of our good will and Socialist fraternity, and pledge ourselves to work for the overthrow of capitalism and the triumph of Socialism. The World for the Workers."

That attitude has been vindicated and stands on record to justify our oft-repeated claim of the truth and unchallengeable soundness of our position. Compared with the confusion and treachery of the pseudo organisations of this and other countries boasting that they champion the workers and represent their interests, we enjoy the supreme confidence which invigorates our consistent and unfailing efforts in the prosecution of the class war.

The facts, therefore, which the workers have to grasp are, that under the existing social order they are wage slaves; the only thing they possess is their power to labour, which they are compelled to sell in order to live.

The workers are poor because they are robbed of the greater portion of the wealth which they produce. The necessities of life are produced by the social labour of the workers, but the means and instruments for producing these necessities are owned and controlled by the capitalist class. It is because of this antagonism, this contradiction, in society, i.e., social produc-

Continued on p. 119.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

- BATTERSEA.**—Communications to A. Hunt, 1 Marlow St., Ladbroke Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 76 Cr. St. N. York Rd.
- BIRMINGHAM.**—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 71 Market rd., Handsworth, Birmingham.
- CENTRAL.**—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Com. sec. Applications to General Secy.
- EAST LONDON.**—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Edg. St., Mile-end, E.3.
- EDMONTON.**—Communications to the Secy., 143 Balwin rd., Edmonton, N.16.
- HACKNEY.**—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.
- ISLINGTON.**—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 241 Seven Sisters rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lechlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.
- MANCHESTER.**—Communications to Sec., 70 New-castle-st., Hulme, Manchester.
- N.W. LONDON.**—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Exmouth St. Schools (L.C.C.), Hampstead rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High rd., Willenden-green, N.W.10.
- SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.**—Communications to Secy, J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea.
- TOOTING.**—Communications to Secy., 207 Derinton rd., Tooting, S.W.
- TOTTENHAM.**—Secy. C. Stowe, 15 Culvert rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.
- WALTHAMSTOW.**—Communications to Secy., 51 Greenleaf rd., Walthamstow. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., alternate Mondays from March 8th. Visitors invited.
- WATFORD.**—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.
- WEST HAM.**—Branch meets Mondays at Upton Cross Schools, Plas' et rd., Upton Manor. Communications to P. Hallard, 23 Colegrave rd., Stratford E.
- WOOD GREEN.**—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook rd., Mayes rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS FOR APRIL.**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

- Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7 p.m.

Wednesdays:

- Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.
Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

- Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

Fridays:

- Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

- Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING, HENRIETTA, 2,

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The Socialist Party of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 189 VOL. 16.]

LONDON, MAY, 1920

[MONTHLY, TWO PENCE

THE HISTORICAL METHOD OF MARX.

REPRINTED FROM THE "INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW," OCT., 1907.

The mode of production of the physical means of life dominates as a rule the development of the social, political and intellectual life.
KARL MARX.

I.

The Socialist Critiques.

Marx, half a century ago proposed a new method for the interpretation of history, which he and Engels have applied in their studies. It is not surprising that the historians, sociologists and philosophers, fearing lest the communist thinker corrupt their innocence and cause them to lose the favour of the bourgeoisie, should ignore this method; but it is strange that Socialists should hesitate to employ it, possibly for fear of arriving at conclusions which might rumple their bourgeois notions, to which they unconsciously remain prisoners. Instead of experimenting with it so as to judge it from its use, they prefer to discuss the question of its value and they discover innumerable defects in it; it misconceives, they say, the ideal and its operation; it brutalises eternal truths and principles; it takes no account of the individual and of his role; it leads to an economic fatalism which excuses man from all effort, etc. What would these comrades think of a carpenter who, instead of working with the hammers, saws and planes put at his disposal, should quarrel with them? Since no perfect tools exist, he would have plenty of chance to rail at them. Criticism does not begin to be fruitful instead of futile, until it comes after experience, which, better than the most subtle reasoning, makes us sensible of imperfections and teaches us to correct them. Man first used the clumsy stone hammer, and its use taught him to transform it into more than a hundred types, differing in their raw material, their weight, and their form.

Leucippus and his disciple Democritus, five centuries before the Christian Era, introduced the conception of the atom to explain the make-up of mind and matter, and during more than two thousand years, philosophers, the idea not occurring to them of resorting to experience that they might test the atomic hypothesis, indulged in discussions on the atom in itself, on the fulness of matter indefinitely continued, on emptiness, discontinuity, etc. and it is not until the end of the 18th century that Dalton utilised the conception of Democritus to explain chemical combinations. The atom, with which the philosophers had been able to do nothing, became in the hands of the chemists "one of the most powerful tools of research that human reason has succeeded in creating." But now, after its use, the marvellous tool has been found imperfect and the radio-activity of matter obliges the physicists to pulverise the atom, that ultimate particle of matter, indivisible and impenetrable, into ultra-ultimate particles, of the same nature in all atoms, and carriers of electricity. The atomicules, a thousand times smaller than the atom of hydrogen, the smallest of atoms, are said to whirl with an extraordinary velocity around a central nucleus, as the planets and earth revolve around the sun. The atom might be a miniature solar system and the elements of the bodies which we know might differ in themselves only in number and the gyratory movements of their atomicules. The recent discoveries of radio-activity, which shake fundamental laws of mathematical physics, ruin the atomic base of the chemical structure. It is impossible to mention a more noteworthy example of the sterility of verbal discussions and the fertility of experience. Action alone in the material and intellectual world is fruitful: "In the beginning was action."

Economic determinism* is a new tool put by Marx at the disposal of Socialists to establish a little order in the [disorder of historic facts, which the historians and philosophers have been incapable of classifying and explaining. Their class prejudices and their narrowness of mind give to the Socialists the monopoly of this tool; but the latter before using it wish to convince themselves that it is absolutely perfect and that it may become the key to all the problems of history; on this account it is quite possible for them to continue during the whole of their lives to discourse and to write articles and volumes on historical materialism, without adding a single idea to the subject. Men of science are less timorous. They think that "from the practical point of view it is of secondary importance that theories and hypotheses be correct provided they guide us to results in agreement with the facts." Truth, after all, is merely the best working hypothesis; often error is the shortest road to discovery. Christopher Columbus, starting from the error in figuring made by Ptolemy, on the circumference of the earth, discovered America, when he thought he was arriving at the East Indies. Darwin recognises that the first idea of his theory of natural selection was suggested to him by the false law of Malthus on population, which he accepted with closed eyes. Physicists can to-day perceive that the hypothesis of Democritus is insufficient to include the phenomena recently studied, yet that does not alter the fact that it served to build up modern chemistry.

It is in fact little observed that Marx has not presented his method of historical interpretation as a body of doctrine with axioms, theorems, corollaries and lemmas; it is for him merely an instrument of research; he formulates it in a workmanlike style and puts it to the test. It can thus be criticised only by contesting the results which it gives in his hands, for instance, by refuting his theory of the class struggle. This our historians and philosophers carefully refrain from doing. They regard it as the impure work of the demon, precisely because it has led Marx to the discovery of this powerful motive force in history.

II.

Deistic and Idealistic Philosophies of History.

History is such a chaos of facts beyond man's control, progressing and receding, clashing and interclashing, appearing and disappearing without apparent reason, that we are tempted to

* We prefer Marx's own term, "The Materialist Conception of History."—Editors "S.S."

think it impossible to bind them and classify them into series from which can be discovered the causes of evolution and revolution.

The collapse of systems in history has given rise in the minds of thinking men like Helmholtz to the doubt whether it is possible to formulate a historical law that reality would confirm. This doubt has become so general that the intellectuals no longer venture to construct like the philosophers of the first half of the 19th century plans of universal history; it is indeed an echo of the incredulity of the economists as to the possibility of controlling economic forces. But need we conclude from the difficulties of the historic problem and the ill-success of attempts to solve it that its solution is beyond the reach of the human mind? In that case social phenomena would stand apart as the only ones which could not be logically linked to determining causes.

Commonsense has never admitted such an impossibility; on the contrary, men have always believed that what came to them, fortunate or unfortunate, was part of a plan preconceived by a superior being. *Man proposes and God disposes* is a historical axiom of popular wisdom which carries as much truth as the axioms of geometry, on condition, however, that we interpret the meaning of the word God.

All peoples have thought that a god directed their history. The cities of antiquity each possessed a State divinity or *poliad* as the Greeks called it, watching over their destinies and dwelling in the temple consecrated to him. The Jehovah of the Old Testament was a divinity of this kind; he was lodged in a wooden box, called "Ark of the Covenant," which was transported when the tribes of Israel changed their location, and which was placed at the front of the armies in order that he might fight for his people. He took his quarrels so much to heart, according to the Bible, that he exterminated his enemies,—men, women, children, and beasts. The Romans, during the Second Punic War, thought it useful as a means of resistance to Hannibal to couple up their State divinity with that of Pessinus, namely Cybele, the mother of gods; they brought over from Asia Minor her statue, a big shapeless stone, and introduced into Rome her orgiastic worship: as they were at once superstitious and astute politicians, they annexed the State divinity of each conquered city, sending its statue to the capitol; they reasoned that, no longer dwelling among the conquered people, it would cease to protect them.

The Christians had no other idea of divinity when, to drive out the Pagan gods, they broke their statues and burned their temples, and when they called on Jesus and his eternal

Father to battle with the demons who stirred up the heresies of Allah which opposed the crescent to the cross. The cities of the Middle Ages put themselves under the protection of municipal divinities; St. Genevieve was that of Paris. The republic of Venice, that it might have an abundance of these protecting divinities, brought over from Alexandria the skeleton of St. Mark and stole at Montpellier that of St. Roques. Civilised nations have never denied the Pagan belief: each monopolizes for its use the only and universal God of the Christians, and makes therefrom its State divinity. Thus there are as many only and universal Gods as there are Christian nations, and the former fight among themselves as soon as the latter declare war; each nation prays its only and universal God to exterminate its rival and sings *Te Deums* in His honour if it is victorious, convinced that it owes its triumph only to His all-powerful intervention. The belief in the intrusion of God into human quarrels is not simulated by statesmen to please the coarse superstition of ignorant crowds; they share it. The private letters recently published, which Bismarck wrote to his wife during the war of 1870-71, show him believing that God passed His time in occupying Himself with him, his son and the Prussian armies.

The philosophers who have taken God for the directing guide of history share this infatuation; they imagine that this God, creator of the universe and humanity, can be interested in nothing else than their country, religion and politics. Bossuet's "Discourse on Universal History" is one of the most successful specimens of the kind: the Pagan nations exterminate each other to prepare for the coming of Christianity, his religion, and the Christian nations slaughter each other to assure the greatness of France, his country, and the glory of Louis XIV., his master. The historic movement, guided by God, culminated in the Sun-King; when he was extinguished, shadows invaded the world, and the Revolution, which Joseph de Maistre calls "the work of Satan," burst forth.

Satan triumphed over God, the State divinity of the aristocracy and the Bourbons. The bourgeoisie, the class which God held in small regard, possessed itself of power and guillotined the king He had anointed: natural sciences, which He had cursed, triumphed and engendered for the bourgeoisie more riches than He had been able to give to His favourites, the nobles and the legitimate kings; Reason, which he had bound, broke her chains and dragged Him before her tribunal. The reign of Satan had begun. The romantic poets of the first half of the nineteenth century composed

hymns in his honour; he was the unconquerable vanquished, the great martyr, the consoler and hope of the oppressed; he symbolised the bourgeoisie in perpetual revolt against nobles, priests, and tyrants. But the victorious bourgeoisie had not the courage to take him for its State divinity; it patched up God, whom Reason had slightly disfigured, and restored him to honour; nevertheless, not having entire faith in His omnipotence, it added to Him a troop of demigods: Progress, Justice, Liberty, Civilisation, Humanity, Fatherland, etc., who were chosen to preside over the destinies of the nations who had shaken off the yoke of the aristocracy.

These new gods are Ideas, "Spiritual Forces," "imponderable Forces." Hegel undertook to bring back this polytheism of Ideas into the monotheism of the Idea, which, born of itself, creates the world and history by its own unfolding. The God of historic philosophy is a mechanic who, for His amusement constructs the universe, whose movements he regulates, and manufactures man, whose destinies He directs after a plan known to Himself alone, but the philosophic historians have not perceived that this eternal God is not the creator but the creature of man, who, in proportion to his own development, remodels Him, and that, far from being the director, He is the plaything of historic events.

The philosophy of the idealists, in appearance less childish than that of the deists, is an unfortunate application to history of the deductive method of the abstract sciences, whose propositions, logically linked, flow from certain undemonstrable axioms which impose themselves by the principle of evidence. The mathematicians are wrong in not troubling themselves regarding the fashion in which the ideas slipped into the human mind. The idealists disdain to inquire into the origin of their Ideas, coming no one knows whence; they confine themselves to affirming that they exist of themselves, that they are perfectible, and that in proportion as they become perfect they modify men and social phenomena, placed under their control; thus it is only necessary to know the evolution of Ideas to acquire the laws of history. In this way Pythagoras thought that the knowledge of the properties of numbers would give knowledge of the properties of bodies.

But because the axioms of mathematics cannot be demonstrated by reasoning, that does not prove that they are not properties of bodies, just like colour, form, weight and warmth, which experience alone reveals, and the idea of which exists in the brain only because man has come into contact with the bodies of nature. It is, in fact, as impossible to prove by reasoning

that a body is square, coloured, heavy or warm as to demonstrate that the part is smaller than the whole, that two and two make four, etc., all we can do is to state the experimental fact and draw its logical conclusions.

The Ideas of Progress, Justice, Liberty, Fatherland, etc., like the axioms of mathematics, do not exist of themselves and outside the spiritual domain; they do not precede experience but follow it; they do not engender the events of history, but they are the consequence of the social phenomena which in evolving create them, transform them, and suppress them; they do not become active forces save as they emanate directly from the social streams. One of the tasks of history unnoticed by the philosophers is the discovery of the social causes, of which they themselves are the product, and which give them the power of acting upon the brains of the men of a given epoch.

Bossuet and the deist philosophers, who promoted God to the dignity of a conscious director of the historic movement, have after all merely conformed to the popular opinion of the historic role played by the divinity; the idealists who substitute for Him the Idea-Forces merely utilise in historic fashion the vulgar bourgeois opinion. Every bourgeois proclaims that his private and public acts are inspired by Progress, Justice, Patriotism, Humanity, etc. To be convinced of this we need only go through the advertisements of the manufacturers and merchants, the prospectuses of the financiers, and the electoral programmes of the politicians.

The ideas of Progress and of evolution are modern in their origin; they are a transportation into history of that *human perfectibility* which became fashionable with the eighteenth century. It was inevitable that the bourgeoisie should regard its entrance into power as an immense step of social progress, while the aristocracy looked upon it as a disastrous setback. The French revolution, because it occurred a century after the English Revolution, and consequently in conditions more fully ripe, substituted so suddenly and completely the bourgeoisie for the nobility that from that time the idea of Progress took firm root in the public opinion of Europe. The European capitalists believed themselves founded on the power of Progress. They affirmed in good faith that their habits, manners, virtues, private and public morality, social and family organisation, industry and commerce were an advance over everything which had existed. The past was only ignorance, barbarity, injustice and unreason: "Finally, for the first time," cried Hegel, "Reason was to govern the world." The bourgeois of 1793 deified her; already in the beginning of the bourgeois period in the ancient

world Plato (in the *Timæus*) declared her superior to Necessity, and Socrates reproached Anaxagoras with having, in his cosmogony, explained everything by material causes without having made any use of Reason, from whom everything could be hoped (Phædo). The social dominance of the bourgeoisie is the reign of Reason.

But a historical event, even so considerable as the grasping of power by the bourgeoisie, does not alone suffice to prove Progress. The deists had made God the sole author of history; the idealists, not wishing it to be said that Progress in the past had deported itself as a *do-nothing Idea*, discovered that during the Middle Ages it had prepared for the triumph of the bourgeois class by organising it, by giving it intellectual culture, and by enriching it, while it wore out the offensive and defensive fortress of the Church. The idea of evolution was thus to introduce itself naturally in the train of the idea of Progress.

But for the bourgeoisie there is no progressive evolution save that which prepares for its own triumph, and as it is only for some ten centuries that its historians can find definite traces of its organic development, they lose their Ariadne's thread as soon as they venture into the labyrinth of earlier history, whose facts they are satisfied to narrate without attempting to marshal them into progressive series. Since the goal of progressive evolution is the establishment of the social dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, that end once attained Progress must cease to progress. In fact, the bourgeois who proclaim that their capture of power is a social progress unique in history, declare that it would be a return to barbarism, "to slavery," as Herbert Spencer says, if they were dislodged from power by the proletariat. The vanquished aristocracy looked upon its defeat in no other light. Belief in the decree of Progress, instinctive and unconscious in the bourgeois masses, shows itself conscious and reasoned in certain bourgeois thinkers. Hegel and Comte, to cite merely two of the most famous, affirm squarely that their philosophic system closes the series, that it is the crowning and the end of the progressive evolution of thought. So, then, philosophy and social and political institutions progress only to arrive at their bourgeois form, then Progress progresses no more.

The bourgeoisie and its more intelligent intellectuals, who fix insurmountable limits to their progressive Progress, do better still; they withdraw from its influence certain social organisms of prime importance. The economists, historians, and moralists, to demonstrate in an irrefutable fashion that the paternal form

of the family and the individual form of property will not be transformed, assure us that they have existed from all time. They put forth these impudent assertions at the moment when researches which have been carried on for half a century are bringing into clear light the primitive forms of the family and of property. These bourgeois scientists are ignorant of them, or reason as if they were ignorant of them.

The ideas of Progress and of evolution were especially fashionable during the first years of the nineteenth century, when the bourgeoisie was still intoxicated with its political victory, and with the prodigious development of its economic riches; the philosophers, historians, moralists, politicians, romancers, and poets fitted their writings and their teachings to the sauce of progressive Progress, which Fourier was alone or almost alone in reviling. But toward the middle of the century they were obliged to calm their immoderate enthusiasm: the apparition of the proletariat on the political stage in England and in France awoke in the mind of the bourgeoisie certain disquieting reflections on the eternal duration of its social dominance. Progressive Progress lost its charms. The ideas of Progress and of evolution would finally have ceased to be current in bourgeois phraseology had not the men of science, who from the end of the eighteenth century had grasped the idea of evolution circulating in the social environment, utilised it to explain the formation of worlds and the organisation of vegetables and animals. They gave it such a scientific value and such a popularity that it was impossible to sidetrack it.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Chas. H. Kerr.)

(To be Continued.)

NOTICES.

The attention of comrades is drawn to the fact that we are running an Economic Class at the Head Office. The class meets every Thursday at 8 p.m.

Even those who feel pretty strong in economics should try to go through this course with a view to fitting themselves to take similar classes when the need and opportunity arise, as they undoubtedly will in the near future.

We have received a request for some back numbers of the SOCIALIST STANDARD to complete a file for the New South Wales (Australia) Reference and Research Library. Can any reader oblige with copies of issues prior to 1911?

A USEFUL BOOK.

"A PRIMER OF SOCIALISM," by THOMAS KIRKUP
Third Edition. Revised and partly re-written by
Edward R. Pease. London: A. & C. Black, Ltd.,
Soho Square, W.1.

In a prefatory note to this volume Mr. Pease informs the reader that the first nine chapters are reprinted from the second edition (July 1910) without material alteration, the remaining six chapters, which brings the story up to August 1919, being written by himself.

The volume, although somewhat scrappy, is interesting in two respects. First, it contains brief but clear descriptions of the most important working-class movements of the earlier period, together with items of biological interest about the leaders connected with them. Its second and most interesting feature is its arrangement. Economic changes in the past and the rise of the present system are lightly dealt with in the first and second chapters. Then follow four chapters dealing with the aspirations and efforts of the early reformers and utopians. The story of their efforts is closed by Kirkup with a brief but fairly accurate survey of the "Marxian Philosophy," and the founding of the First International. Mr. Pease takes up the thread and, in the same brief but clear manner, recounts the history of the working-class movement since that time.

Kirkup tells of the blind groping of the early reformers after the truth and its final discovery by Marx. Mr. Pease tells of the blind groping away from the truth and the deliberate enthronement of confusion by the agents of the master class.

Necessarily brief, the chapter allotted to Marx merely gives a short summary of the meaning of surplus-value, the antagonism of interests between the working class and the capitalist class, and the necessity of working-class organisation for political supremacy with the object of taking possession of the means of wealth-production. After this outspoken declaration the following chapters read like a betrayal of the working class by its leaders. The reformism of the British Labour Party—including the so-called Socialist parties that accept its electoral programmes for parliamentary seats—the suicidal nonsense of the Anarchists and Syndicalists, and the utopian absurdities of the Guild Socialists are inexcusable. Once the position of the working class has been scientifically determined and the knowledge made available, those who pose as leaders and ignore it are guilty of treachery to the working class. Mr. Pease writes in full sympathy with the labour movement, but the

discriminating reader will be at once struck by the inconsistency of a working class movement based on reform after the discovery by Marx that the working class must be revolutionary.

Kirkup is rather severe on the "Communist Manifesto," which he says gives "in a violent and exaggerated form, the views which Marx afterwards elaborated in his large work on Capital." But his previous summary of the Marxian philosophy takes the sting out of his own adjectives. Whether expressed in the cold, lofty terms of the critic or the forceful eloquence of Marx himself, the philosophy is always convincing, and as a Manifesto issued to the workers of all lands, the "Communist Manifesto" has never been surpassed.

On pages 69 and 70 Mr. Pease falls into a common error when he writes about "Marxian Socialism" not being the type of Socialism to make any progress in this country. This is the paltry excuse of the labour leaders who "know all about Socialism" but see nothing profitable in the work of propagating it. They try to throw the blame for their own treachery on the workers—but the workers look to them for the truth, expecting, in their simplicity, to get it because of the expressed sympathy of those leaders. They thus add meanness to their treachery, because it is impossible for them to know what the workers will accept until they try them.

On page 92 Mr. Pease tells the truth about the attitude of the Labour Party towards the war, and members of that party should cease to boast about their opposition. Our author is very emphatic. "The Labour Party," he says, "supported the Government in the prosecution of the war from first to last." The I.L.P., he states, was, however, split into two sections, supporters of the Government and pacifists, who worked loyally together in spite of what would appear to be a vital difference of principle. This is easily explained when we remember that the pacifists were merely in opposition on humanitarian grounds against war in general as a method of settling capitalist disputes. Their two main contentions were that peace should be obtained by negotiation, and that the conscientious objector should be released from the obligation to serve. All the so-called Socialist parties supported the Government in its prosecution of the war, and issued manifestoes declaring their loyalty. Even the prominent pacifists of the I.L.P. asserted that it was the duty of every man to assist the Government in carrying out its objects.

A rather curious slip is made on page 78 that the publishers might note. The organisation known as the I.W.W. is said to be the "Independent Workers of the World."

To those members of the English Labour Party who blame the Social Democrats of Germany for their support of the war an interesting statement is made by Mr. Pease. He says: "During the few days when war was still in doubt the German Social Democrats held big meetings all over the country to protest against it. But their action was in vain. Similar efforts on a smaller scale were made by Socialists in England and elsewhere." If this comparison is true, neither the English nor any other labour party have any grounds for accusing the German Social Democrats of giving support to their government, seeing that their own efforts to prevent the war were the feeblest.

Mr. Pease is optimistic about the near future of the labour movement. He says, "unless therefore, the course of events takes altogether a fresh turn, a few years hence will see the Socialist parties in control of stable governments, ruling some of the largest and most highly developed countries of the world."

Does this mean that in a few years Socialism will be established? Not according to Mr. Pease, who has already told us that these "Socialist parties" are not built on Socialist principles. But what does government by these so-called Socialist parties mean? We can best answer that question by an examination of their election programmes. When we do this we find that none of these parties run candidates pledged to the abolition of the capitalist system and the establishment of Socialism. The leaders of these parties who may be elected to the national assemblies have no mandate except for the reform of the present system. Before they can have such a mandate the workers must be educated to that degree of knowledge that will enable them to consciously give it; but the leaders do not educate the workers in that direction at all, they simply take advantage of their ignorance to persuade them to support capitalist governments. This is proved by their own statement that they can provide an alternative government to the present coalition. Some of the extremists of the movement talk of State ownership, guild Socialism, and even of common ownership, but the wiseheads of the movement, who interpret correctly the degree of working-class knowledge, are seldom mistaken. The so-called Socialist and Labour parties do not educate the workers at all, they simply frame their own utterances on the superstitions engendered in the minds of the workers by other capitalist agents.

If the Marxian philosophy is correct, the workers cannot emancipate themselves until they understand it. The leaders of the various working-class parties in this country have not yet commenced to teach it; from any point of

view, therefore, they have made no progress whatever. Real progress can only be measured by the numbers in the Socialist ranks, by the votes they register for Socialism, and by the strength and breadth of the movement. Any other sort of progress, such as obtaining parliamentary seats by compromise with Liberals, or on programmes identical with the Liberals, is merely progress for the leaders toward the goal of their ambitions—a share of the plunder and a place in the sun.

As a short history of working-class movements both Kirkup and Pease have given us something that is reliable, though that portion of the work that has been undertaken by Mr. Pease is a record of error and confusion spread by self-appointed leaders. To the intelligent worker this will be plain if he but recognises the significance of the chapters dealing with the Marxian philosophy.

F. F.

THE REASON WHY.

Conscription has been officially abolished.

Yes, but not because you did not like it. Our masters have learned during this last war that the day of individual skill with arms is long past. Killing men and wrecking towns and villages is a business that is made quite simple for those who finally DO the business, and those who really pay for the upkeep of the Army and Navy (not you, my fellow worker) are out to cut down expenses in this as in all other things.

A standing army of 220,000 professional killers, and a half-baked army of umpteen territorials will be quite sufficient to keep the wage-slaves in subjection both at home and abroad, and that is all that our masters require until the next "war to end war" comes along.

Then you will see if conscription is finished. Together with its inseparable ally, D.O.R.A., it will be trotted out afresh for your benefit—to be the only hope of saving YOUR liberty, YOUR home (if the brokers haven't already been in), YOUR everything. YOU, who will be called up to "make one," or perhaps your son, who is such a dear little fellow now, will very soon be taught "discipline" and smattering enough of the methods of killing to go into the new mud-alley or trenches to make a heroic fight for liberty against "militarism" or some other terrible "ism."

A few hours No. 1 Field Punishment will brighten up your intellect considerably, and you will learn to be courageous too—when there's a firing party and a hole in the ground waiting for you if you show a sign of being otherwise.

You might be one of the "knowing" ones who say "Never again: I've been had once," but, my friend, when those terrible conditions come again, as come again they must under the present system of society, you will be in no better position to resist these dispensers of khaki suits, homes for heroes, and unemployment doles than you ever were.

Do you ever think over this? If you don't you are sadly deficient in self-consideration. If you DO, what conclusions have you come to? What can you do to help yourself?

THE ONLY WAY to help yourself in the matter is to do all you can to help bring in a system of society where "international" fights are totally unnecessary, where YOU can live a life of peace with plenty, where NO unemployment exists, and where no human being starves in the midst of plenty as they do now under the aegis of something that many of us, in our pitifully blind ignorance, call civilisation.

The necessary system of society for these wonderful benefits to become yours and mine is the SOCIALIST system; nothing short of it.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain claim, and prove their claim, to be the only party in Great Britain whose principles will benefit the working class. We have no connection with I.L.P., B.S.P., L.P., S.D.P., or any other old P. of people who are only interested in two things: firstly, grinding their own axes; secondly, trying to make the present rotten capitalist system bearable to you, thereby prolonging the life of that system which grinds YOU down so mercilessly.

If you are a thoughtful man come and consider our principles and policy. You will be welcome at any of our meetings, no matter whether Executive, Branch, or propaganda meetings. We cordially welcome your serious interest. If you have questions to ask, come to our meetings and ask them. I assure you of a civil and scientifically considered answer. The keener your intelligence the keener your welcome from us, for we want the help of intelligent men, and intelligent men will want to help to spread our propaganda when they have got the knowledge of what we stand for. Never mind if you are poor in pocket—we are poor men and women ourselves—but the richer you are in sense—common sense—the better we will like you, for we are not out to mislead anyone.

A list of Branches, together with the times and places of their meetings, will be found at the end of this paper. Come to any of our meetings and enquire: it costs you nothing—and knowledge awaits you.

SELIM,

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the SOCIALIST STANDARD, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free	1s. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " " " "	...	9d.

The Socialist Standard,



SATURDAY, MAY 1, 1920.

CAPITALISM'S DARK HOUR.

We used to hear much more than we do now about the awful prospects that awaited the peoples of the world in the event of their deciding to substitute Socialism for capitalism. Not only were we to wade to our goal through a sea of blood, but we were to find, when we reached our Land of Promise, that instead of being a land flowing with milk and honey, it was a stoney and sterile desert. Famine and rape would stalk the land; anarchy and chaos would overwhelm humanity; ruin and destruction would embrace all—all except the capitalists, departed per Cooks, with their capital (per Pickford) to "Wangaloo, in unpacific seas."

Talk of that kind is not very fashionable just now—not that Socialism is any more attractive to those who used to indulge in such vapourings, but they are rather afraid to throw stones for very obvious reasons.

However, if our opponents dare not talk of such things that is no reason why we should be deterred, while on the other hand there are good reasons for reminding our fellow wage slaves of the hypocritical taunts that our capitalist enemies have not the impudence to use just at present.

We are moved to these remarks by the awful spectacle of human misery which capitalism in her very prime offers to our eyes. For some days there has appeared in orthodox Press a most agonising appeal for funds to relieve the starving multitudes of what are now called the famine areas of Europe. In this appeal the statement is made that FIVE MILLION child-

ren are in danger of starvation, and we read this tragic announcement:

"News is just to hand that only those children between three and five can be helped; the mites under three must be abandoned to starvation, for there will not be enough food to go round if these are included."

and it is commented, "It has been necessary deliberately to select which children shall be saved and which must be left to die."

Those who have with such cool effrontery declared that Socialism could not feed her populations have here something to think about. The present system, with all its wonderfully fertile means of production, is helpless to prevent catastrophes of such dimensions of horror as no act of nature within human knowledge has ever equalled—nay, it is not merely that it is unable to prevent them: it produces them.

How utterly helpless the system is to cope with its own products is vividly shown by two other statements in the heart-rending appeal. "Our docks are choked with food," it says. "Food is ready, clothing is ready." That is the first statement. "I am convinced that Central Europe is in danger of a famine that may involve all nations in a common ruin," Dr. Arthur Guttery is reported to have stated. So, though there are ample means at hand to save these starving people, and though their misery is the concern of all other nations inasmuch as it is a standing menace of disaster, even to ruin, to all other nations, because those means are the property of the few instead of being the property of society, nothing can be done. Here the accumulated stocks of mutton cause the Government embarrassment, so that they are compelled to lower the price in order to induce people to eat more freely of it; there men, women and children are dying in thousands, and threatening to scourge the world with epidemic, for want of that very surplus mutton—yet this accursed system has no other solution to the problem than private charity, which really is no solution at all.

There is another side to the question which should disturb the complacency of those who regard themselves as so detached from this great tragedy as to be not greatly concerned. Only three short years ago it needed but a slight turning of the fortunes of war to have brought this awful calamity upon the mothers and fathers and children of this land. And more, it may yet be the experience of those now living in this country to find their food supply cut off by foreign powers. A comparatively weak naval force, operating in the wide ocean spaces, could do it, and capitalism shows itself capable, in the struggle for markets, of condemning rival nations to death.

THE OUTCOME.

To what the so-called practical politics of the Labour Party and I.L.P. lead is plainly demonstrated by the recent Stockport election.

It will be remembered that a vacancy occurred in the Stockport constituency through the death of Mr. Spencer Leigh Hughes. Immediately following upon this the Labour member for Stockport (Mr. Wardle), who held one of the "bait" posts which the Government allots to Labourites who serve them well, resigned on account of "ill health" (a term which covers a multitude of political sins). No doubt the two items are connected in many ways by various people, but the S.P.G.B. sums up the affair in two words—

POLITICAL BARGAINING.

In a review of the election result "The Lobby Correspondent" writes in the "Daily News" of April 12th:

"The retention of Stockport was made possible by a deal between the Coalition parties in the constituency. This involved the resignation of Mr. Wardle, a minister, on the ground of ill-health."

Obviously Mr. Wardle's seat had been gained at the previous election by means of a deal between the Labour and the Coalition parties, and he was compelled to resign because of a new arrangement between the Coalition Liberals and the Unionists to split their vote.

Time after time these "deals" have been exposed in the Official Organ of our party; also it has been shown how gratifying they have proved to the Liberal Party. Now, however, when capitalist groups have been re-shuffled in the course of development to suit variations in sectional interests, and Mr. Asquith is attempting to lead an

"INDEPENDENT POLITICAL FORCE" TO SUPREMACY, the tone of his particular group has changed somewhat. Speaking at the National Liberal Club Mr. Featherstone Asquith said "There was an experiment made at Stockport, one of the most ingenious feats that I remember of political legerdemain." (How Mr. Asquith must revel in memories of similar exploits!) He continues, "You cannot always get a sitting member so accommodating . . . as to convert a single into a double vacancy." ("Daily News," 15.4.20.)

True, Herbert, but he who pays the piper calls the tune, and the "practical politics," the double-dealing and trickery which leads to pelf and place for labour leaders, allows for such

ACCOMMODATING ARRANGEMENTS.

And what of the great Sir Leo. C. Money, who, after being defeated at Tottenham, was

rushed to do the "big man" stunt at Stockport. Commenting on the defeat of himself and Mr. Perry (Lab. Co-op.) he said: "There has been no real Labour fight before in Stockport. For many years contests have been in the character of sham fights where in double-barrelled constituencies progressives were invited to divide their votes between the Liberal and Labour Parties." ("Daily News," 12.4.20. Italics mine.)

We confirm Sir Leo's statement but add that there has been no fight made by the Labour Party in any constituency in the true interest of the working class. More of that anon.

As an illustration of how an opportunist can take advantage of a compulsory lapse from previous opportunism to

AFFIRM HIS STRAIGHTNESS

the foregoing quotation serves very well, while the following from the Printers Register for 6.2.19 is an interesting sidelight on Sir Leo. Money's past:

"The 'Labour Leader' announces that Sir Leo has consented to become a regular contributor to its pages.

"This announcement recalls Sir Leo's description of the 'Labour Leader' in the House of Commons, when he wanted the Government to deal drastically with that paper. He said 'The "Labour Leader" ever since the war began deliberately pursued week by week a policy of misrepresenting the present and past motives of the British Government, of . . . suggesting that war was provoked by British Diplomacy and aggression, of publishing an article charging the Prime Minister and the Foreign Secretary with deliberately deceiving the House of Commons, and in various other ways seeking to make it difficult for the United Kingdom to prosecute the war with success. During the past eleven months the "Labour Leader" has published repeated discouragements to its readers to support the national cause or take part in the war.'"

The noodle-headed but sincere members of the I.L.P. will be interested in this slice of Sir Leo's history. It may even lead them to critically analyse the sayings and actions of the "practical" politicians and refer to S.P.G.B. literature for more irrefragable facts of their

LEADERS' CHARLATANISM.

Why this sudden conversion to the ranks of Labour? Why this new-found interest on the part of Sir Leo, Lord Haldane, and others of their kind in the ability of Labour to govern?

Methinks the wind has shifted slightly and sails are being trimmed accordingly. The Labour Party is attracting lords, knights, etc.,

to add to the fakirs already within its ranks. But adding remnants of the feudal aristocracy, disgruntled officers, petit-bourgeois, budding capitalist and pseudo-Socialist politicians to its membership—embodying schemes for nationalisation of this or that industry, better goals for the workers, etc., to its programme—does not help the workers forward one iota in the accomplishment of their historic mission.

And so we address ourselves to the working class:—The machines and tools with which you produce vast quantities of wealth—themselves the product of labour—are owned by the master class. You are compelled to sell the only commodity you possess—the power to labour—to the owners of those tools for a miserable pittance varying but little from the actual cost of subsistence, while they, the minority in society, take to themselves the fruits of your labour.

YOU ARE EXPLOITED!

You lose one master, but are compelled to find another, and because of your non-ownership of the means of producing the necessities of life you are enslaved to the possessing class—the capitalists. Constantly you are confronted with the fear of unemployment, and conditions do not improve—they are getting worse.

Gulled by the cant and hypocrisy of Press, pulpit, and capitalist political agents (Tory, Liberal, and Labour), you have in the past voted back into political power, because of promises, the representatives of the class which is interested in governing you and keeping you in subjection. Your interests are opposed to those of the exploiters, and you will be exploited and oppressed by them until you realise your true position, and organise as a class into a political party with the object of capturing the

POLITICAL POWER

and overthrowing the present system of contradictions of wealth and poverty, and the conversion of the means of wealth production from instruments of profit-grinding into common property to be administered for the well-being of all.

The remedy is in your own hands—the working class are the majority in society, and the majority must be brought to an understanding and acceptance of the principles of the S.P.G.B. as printed in this and every issue of this journal.

Line up! There is no hope for the working class except in the establishment of Socialism.

H. C.

Now that the "S.S." costs you 2d., read it and pass it on.

A GLOOMY PROFESSOR.

"THE UNSOLVED RIDDLE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE," by STEPHEN LEACOCK. London: John Lane, the Bodley Head, Vigo St., W.1. 5s. net.

This book, written by a professor of Political Economy at McGill University, Montreal, is one of the numerous attempts made to explain the "labour unrest" throughout the world, and to propose some remedial measures for it. To be, and remain, a professor at a University necessarily means that one must not put forth ideas or statements that are injurious to the interests of the master class. Should one do so one very quickly loses one's chair, and is forced to seek employment in another direction.

This does not prevent certain guarded criticisms being made, especially when "unrest" reaches a troublesome stage, but the edge of the criticism is always turned in the end against one or two "exceptional" employers while the majority are shown to be virtuous, hard-working, self-sacrificing benefactors of mankind.

Thus the present volume opens with several important admissions on the conditions existing to day. On page 14 we are told:

With all our wealth we are still poor. After a century and a half of labour-saving machinery we work about as hard as ever. With a power over nature multiplied a hundred fold, nature still conquers us.

And more than this: There are many scenes in which the machine age seems to leave the great bulk of civilised humanity, the working part of it, worse off instead of better.

This point is further emphasised on page 76 where he says:

Labour-saving machinery does not of itself save the working world a single hour of toil; it only shifts it from one task to another.

In the third chapter the author attempts to disprove the usual theories on Value and Price. Especially does he object to the views of Adam Smith and Ricardo that the quantity of labour governs value. After referring to the stock illustration of the primitive savage he contends:

But in the complexity of modern industrial life such a calculation no longer applies; the differences of technical skill, of native ingenuity, and technical preparation become enormous. The hour's work of a common labourer is not the same thing as the hour's work of a watchmaker mending a watch, or of an engineer directing the building of a bridge, or of an architect drawing a plan. There is no way of reducing these hours to a common basis.

The falsity of this statement is proved by everyday experience. Engineers, Architects, trained Technicians, etc., make elaborate and close calculations to show how the time they have to spend in acquiring their special knowledge and training has to be taken into account

when their remuneration is being fixed. Directly or indirectly these multiplications are always applied to the unskilled labourers' standard as the basis of the calculation. Thus in the agitation carried on to-day by the school teachers, many of the speakers are taking the dustman or coalman as a basis for their calculation of what the salary of the teacher should be. A striking illustration of this fact is given in places where technical and professional education is partly or wholly supported from the national taxes. This reduces, or in some cases abolishes the fees that were paid formerly by the students, who are then expected to take lower salaries because their training has cost them less. Chemists in Germany were a front rank instance of this.

It is quite true, as Mr. Leacock says later on, that the payments at a given moment are the outcome of "economic strength." But "economic strength" only determines the range of the "fluctuations," it does not fix the line about which these fluctuations take place. That is determined by the cost of production based upon the average unskilled labourer.

Having admitted so much of the evils of the present system the author turns to remedies. Apart from his own nostrums he only refers to one other proposed remedy, namely, Socialism. This is impossible—"Socialism is a beautiful dream, possible only for the angels" (p. 22). Still he objects to the proscribing and persecution of Socialism, and claims that "It will languish and perish in the dry sunlight of open discussion."

But what is the "Socialism" that Mr. Leacock combats? In this second decade of the twentieth century, sixty-one years after the publication of Marx's "Critique of Political Economy," a critic of Socialism, not an ignorant Christian Evidence ranter, or a Tariff Reform charlatan, but a full-blown "professor" of Political Economy, takes as the standard work on Socialism Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward!" The laws of social evolution are not even mentioned. The stage of development that present society has reached, and the only alternatives before us are passed over and a philanthropic sentimentalist's dream of a future state of society, with all its details fully worked out, is put up to be shot at, while the scientific analysis of capitalism and the discovery of social laws by Marx, Engels, and Morgan are carefully ignored.

Even then what is the author's main objection to "Looking Backward"? It is to the elected managers. They, in his opinion, must work as angels. "Now," he says (p. 106) "Let me ask in the name of sanity where are such officials to be found?" And he answers that they cannot be found anywhere.

What, then, is to be done? For evidently something *must* be done to avert chaos.

The time has gone by when a man shall starve asking in vain for work; when the listless outcast shall draw his rags shivering about him unheeded of his fellows; when children shall be born in hunger and bred in want and broken in toil with never a chance in life. If nothing else will end these things, fear will do it. The hardest capitalist that ever gripped his property with the iron grasp of legal right, relaxes his grasp a little when he thinks of the possibilities of a social conflagration." (P. 119.)

Mr. Leacock's remedies can hardly be described as heroic. "Work must either be found or must be provided by the State itself," he says, and points to the undeveloped lands of Canada, United States, and Australia as being capable of absorbing the labour of generations. Whether this means compulsory emigration we are not told. It is interesting to note in passing that he says much to discredit the Malthusian doctrine.

Put into the plainest of prose, then, we are saying that the government of every country ought to supply work and pay for the unemployed, maintenance for the infirm and aged, and education for the children. (P. 130.)

The two great measures to be applied to this end are the establishment of a minimum wage and the shortening of the hours of labour. Even eight hours a day at a mechanical task is considered too long by our author. These measures are to be brought into operation gradually by the combined means of legislation and collective organisation.

It needs but a superficial examination to show that even a rigorous application of these measures would not affect more than the fringe of the subject. Despite the so-called shortage of commodities, General Haig has been appealing in vain to the employers to give work to hundreds of thousands of demobilised men and officers who are unemployed. Gibing at certain of the trade unions is mere clap-trap as these unions point to the number of unemployed already in their ranks. Above all this, however, is the over-riding constant factor of improving machinery and means of production. These grow far faster than the effective demands of the market can absorb their products. Hence, apart from certain times of fluctuation, the number of unemployed is not only maintained, but is bound to increase.

Against this great fact Mr. Leacock's puny measures are as useless as Mrs. Partington's broom against the sea.

And even then, with unconscious humour, our author turns his own arguments against Socialism upon his own case when he says:

Yet it is clear that a policy of State work and State pay for all who are otherwise unable to find

occupation, involves appalling difficulties. The opportunity will loom large for the prodigal waste of money for the undertaking of public works of no real utility, and for the subsidising of an army of loafers. (P. 120.)

A terrible outlook, truly! And how can it be met? By the very means that our author declared impossible.

Clearly enough a certain modicum of public honesty and integrity is essential for such a task; more, undoubtedly, than we have hitherto been able to enlist in the service of the commonwealth. But without it we perish.

Then, perish we must, for Mr. Leacock has already stated that such people cannot be found.

The Socialist—a student of social evolution—has no use for either the well-meaning Utopias of the Bellamys or the despair of the Leacocks. He knows that the development of the powers of production, their increasing size and complexity, the steady concentration of the means of life into fewer and fewer hands, with its increasing slavery of the workers, will force the problem before mankind:—either social ownership of the Means of Life, or Destruction.

The unrest, the rumblings, the strikes, are all signs that the working class are beginning to kick—still blindly, it is true—against the effects of this system. That restlessness, turned into right channels due to the education the conditions give, aided by the propaganda of the Socialist, will ensure that not destruction but Socialism, will prove the solution of the problem.

J. FITZGERALD.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CONCERNING MARESNESTS AND OTHER THINGS.

TO THE EDITOR.

13, Park Parade, N. Finchley.

Dear Sir,—I am sorry to read your criticism of Mr. Dell's book in your March issue. Your criticism is far more confusing and contradictory than Mr. Dell's clear thinking. For instance, if Voltaire is out of date and keeping with the present condition, how can Marx be up to date? Yet you quote Marx. If Marx lived later than Voltaire, Marx also attempted something more concrete in theories than did Voltaire. Many of his theories have miscarried, therefore they are equally out of date in their usefulness as Voltaire.

The Bolsheviks could no more use Marxism than any other old theory. Does the Editor really believe the workers will ever hold power by the use of the present parliamentary machine? I have been accused of being an

optimist, but I have yet to reach a pitch of exaltation wherein I can believe that a volunteer army officered by Bourgeois will obey a Socialist parliament laws for the abolition of capitalism. I would like to know why the Editor thinks that if armed the workers would readily fight, yet could not be got to strike successfully—especially when one considers that trade unionism the farthest the workers have yet reached to. What difference to the workers when faced with starvation, whether badly armed or not at all? In the division of classes you make a slight mistake by leaving out about half of the population. You have completely forgotten the unhappy, misled, aspiring, unsuccessful Middle Bourgeoisie. He is the hardest worked, heaviest taxed, and perhaps poorest individual in the country. I say this fully realising that this class of slave toils, yet produces not, and that this slave is a hindrance to the workers and the mainstay of capitalism in peace. This middleman would soon be deserted by the capitalist in time of hunger. During a prolonged strike this individual would perforce become convinced of the absence of any affinity 'twixt the capitalist and himself. Perhaps hunger and mutual suffering might weld the link with his fellow wage slave of a differing grade. Mr. Dell is quite right when he says it is inconceivable that the workers will reach a stage of development when they will cease to be true to their education and see clear, while the machinery of public opinion is in the unscrupulous hands of the class who are under no misapprehension as to what is best for themselves and hence worst for the workers. So long as they guide, so long will the workers come in contact with the greatest obstacles in their march to freedom. All clear issues will be confused, all maresnests held up. Anything so long as it is not the real thing. I am not a believer either in the political machinery nor yet in trade unionism. I know that both have evolved with the present system. Yet I would like to see this machine used for the coercion of this present parliamentary machine. These two are of a kind. When the crash comes we would begin to think of the political machinery, a machine that will fit in with the new conditions as they arise. Then we might even arm the proletariat. But at present it is dangerous and useless and a hindrance. I would be very glad if you could find room for this.

J. HORN.

OUR REPLY.

Had Mr. Horn read the review he is so ready to criticise more carefully, he would have found many of his objections met in the review itself. For instance, he would have seen that our ob-

jection to following Voltaire was not that he lived a certain time ago, but that his views were those of the now ruling class. Our critic carefully ignores this point.

Which of Marx's theories have miscarried? We are not told. When our critic can point to what he considers such a case we will examine it.

Whatever the Bolsheviks may have used, they certainly have made the loudest claims that their actions are the purest "Marxism." Mr. Horn should send his denials (without evidence) to them.

The question of the parliamentary machine is another point dealt with in the review. Our correspondent should read it.

The "volunteer" army of Great Britain is officered by wage slaves of the professional type—not the bourgeoisie—and always obeys the orders formulated in Parliament. The Army does not question its orders, and if it is prepared to shoot down its fellow workers when ordered by the masters' Government to do so, surely it has no reason to refuse to shoot the masters at the orders of a Socialist Parliament. Only blind ignorance of the Army and its methods, and the system by which it is controlled, could account for such views as our correspondent puts forth.

The reason the workers could not "strike successfully" for the overthrow of capitalism is another matter fully dealt with in the review.

Mr. Horn first says that we have made a mistake in our division of the classes because we have left out the "middle bourgeoisie." Further on he calls this "bourgeoisie" "fellow wage slaves," thus agreeing with our description of this section.

J. F.

READY SHORTLY.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

SIXTH EDITION,

WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence.

Post free, 3½d. per copy; from the S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

"LOST, STOLEN, OR STRAYED"— AN INTELLECTUAL.

"SOCIALISM AND THE LABOUR PARTY," by BERNARD SHAW. National Guilds League Lecture at Kingsway Hall, London, on Jan. 29th, 1920. A Supplement to the "New Commonwealth." Price 2d.

In dealing with reformers of any kind it is difficult to sort the wheat—what little there is of it—from the chaff in which it is buried.

The above is an excellent instance of this truism. Here we find the usual pot-pourri of good horse-sense and nonsense.

The lecturer says " . . . in all my experience almost all the opposition which reformers meet with arises not really from any particular objection which people have to the reformer's plan; but from their extraordinary ignorance of the existing state of things in which they themselves live, which they often firmly believe does realise the plan of the reformer as far as it is humanly possible for it to be realised."

He does not say anything about the revolutionist; however, apparently it would be unreasonable to expect an individual of the "super"-intellectual calibre of the one and only George Bernard Shaw of that ilk to appreciate the difference.

Shaw then makes an appeal—in the main really good—for unity among the robbed class against the robbers. Like most of his "wheat," it is much too long to quote.

We now come to a fine homily on capitalist honour—although, as might be expected, the lecturer concludes it with an error in which he completely gives away the case for Nationalisation and Municipalisation. This will be dealt with later.

The error referred to is in the statement that "The production of wealth became a matter of the organisation of labour, and that was done by comparatively vulgar persons belonging to what is called the 'middle-class.'"

The lecturer would doubtless be surprised if he were told that there is no middle class. The "organisation of labour" is carried on entirely by the working class, from the managing director to the office-boy.

There was a period in early capitalism when individual owners of the means of production conducted their various businesses themselves. They were called "Captains of Industry." It would possibly be correct to call these people the middle class. But to-day the "Captains of Industry" have by the inexorable march of economic development been forced down into the ranks of the proletariat, and the modern

"Captains of Industry" are the salaried servants—wage slaves of absentee shareholders. These shareholders can be dispensed with at any time that the workers make up their minds to get on with it. So we say, and challenge denial from any quarter, that there is no middle class.

We are told, "if you give a man £50, £100, or £1,000 a day—and that is the sort of income people have nowadays—you can see that then *money saves itself*." Ha! Ha! Ha! He further defines capital as "saved up money." This sort of tripe one expects from an "intellectual." But there —!

If one puts a penny away how long will it be before that penny becomes more? On Shaw's argument it should not take us long to raise that £1,000.

This epistle is written under the title "Lost, Stolen, or Strayed—An Intellectual," and now we come to the point of the title, for if Mr. Shaw is to be taken seriously one can only judge his sincerity at the cost of his intelligence.

After showing how the "old limited aristocracy" retired from business, i.e., that of exploiting the workers, and describing the birth of the "plutocracy" he says: "A career is open to the talented, and society is open to the rich. The particular talent to which a career is open is that of getting as much money as possible out of other people's pockets and putting it into your own."

He goes on, "and most Socialist Societies and a good many eccentric philanthropists here and there, want to turn their backs on this particular principle. They want to stop robbing. They want to go in for general co-operation for the good of the community, in short, for Socialism. Is there any likelihood, any sign, of the formation of a party in this country which will absolutely throw over the idea of robbery and go in for co-operative and common production for the benefit of the whole country?" And so on *ad lib*.

Note the muddle our "intellectual" has got into! He says "most Socialist Societies" want to stop robbery, and in practically the same sentence asks if there is any sign of the formation of such a party!

We are "bored stiff" by a long tirade from Mr. Shaw in which he, instead of showing the true working class position, endeavours to set one section of the proletariat against the rest by discussing the degree of utility of the respective services performed by them. He shows how some are engaged in the actual production of the essentials for human existence, while others are merely domestic servants or even lawyers

or doctors. There is one section which he does not refer to—apparently for personal reasons—but I will mention it for him. It is the dramatists, actors, and the theatrical profession generally. But after all, what does it matter? They are ALL members of the working class, getting their living by the sale of their labour-power.

The pet theory held by Bernard Shaw and his colleagues of the Fabian Society and the Labour Party is that of Nationalisation. It is stated above that Mr. Shaw gives away the case for Nationalisation. I will now produce the evidence from the lecture which is the subject of this criticism.

The lecturer states, and rightly too, that the "old-fashioned robber baron" has largely passed away, and what remains of him—and this is very important—is a tremendous public opinion that it is every man's duty to fight for his country, meaning the robber class for which his country exists.

That is to say that when people speak of the country, or the nation, they mean the exploiting class. Therefore when anything is nationalised all that has happened is that the property which has been nationalised has been transferred from the ownership of a few individual members, or maybe groups of members called companies, etc.) of the capitalist class to the collective ownership of the whole of that class.

There is one point in the lecture that should have been dealt with before.

We are told that Lenin "introduced 'compulsory labour'" into Russia. This has no terror for us, for we have become hardened to it by long experience. But apparently what Lenin did was to introduce compulsory labour, not for the workers, for they had been the subjects of compulsory labour all their lives, but for the exploiting class, who had never done any work previously.

And now I think that sufficient evidence has been produced to show that the person referred to in the title of this article is Mr. George Bernard Shaw, who is the "Intellectual" who is "lost, stolen, or strayed." HUTCH.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

There is an old French proverb: "*Il faut souffrir pour être savant*," which might be translated: "It is necessary to suffer to achieve wisdom," although one might wish it could be translated to mean that wisdom was the inevitable result of suffering. Truly the working class of the world have suffered untold miseries, particularly during the last few years; but, alas! they appear to be no wiser than before.

There were some amongst us who used to comfort ourselves, during the deluge of blood and fury that swept over Europe, with the reflection that surely the proletariat blindly seeking relief would lift their eyes to the right way, the Socialist way, out.

But we find that the terrible memories, the nights of horror, the weary years in blood-soaked trenches are all forgotten and, worse still, forgiven.

What do we read in the daily Press, the criterion of popular thought? What does the average man talk about on his way to work in the morning? Does he ask his neighbour why it is that, in spite of the fact that he was at the capture of Jerusalem, or that he assisted in driving the Germans out of their African colonies, he finds the struggle to live more difficult than before, that his wages are insufficient to keep him in comfort just as they were before, and that, despite the fact that "we" have won the greatest war (as yet) in history, his position has not improved one iota, but has, on the contrary, worsened?

No! listen to him and you will find that he is discussing the chastity of Mrs. Bamberger, expressing the opinion that there is "something in" the spiritual messages transmitted to the Rev. G. Vale Owen, or weighing the chances of his football favourites winning the English Cup. Anything but his own misery—and I defy you to produce a member of the working class to whom misery is not more familiar than the sort of tenth-rate happiness he sometimes enjoys.

A cynic said that nothing but a volcano could lift the working class from the position they now occupy in society. He was right and he was wrong! The volcano has come, yet the working class still grope in the mud and lava it has left behind. But there is still to come the volcano of organised political action. Nothing else will serve. Direct Action is an easily exploded fallacy, Nationalisation is a polysyllabic nothingness as far as the working class are concerned. The Labour Party have never understood the Class Struggle and never preached it. The other parties have been tried and found wanting. All that remains, therefore, is for the proletariat to provide their own vol-

cano. The nucleus whence will burst forth the eruption is the Socialist Party.

It takes no more than average intelligence to understand why the working class are robbed and how to stop that robbery. It will take no more energy than they already sell to the master class to build up their organisation on sound lines. They have the brains to build beautiful houses, luxurious motor-cars, exquisite furniture for their masters. Why, then, will they not do things for themselves? Why remain divorced from the wonderful potentialities of a world young in evolution, still ignorant of its own chemistry, and still possessing all that man can desire? It takes no more than a little thought to understand the absurdity of slavery, and no more than intelligent class-conscious action to win through to happiness, comfort, and security for all men.

Discuss this in your third class "workman's" instead of the Lincolnshire Handicap! S. H. S.

OUR £1,000 FUND.

We publish below our 15th list of subscriptions to the "World for the Workers Fund." As an effort at saving up for the Globe for those who do the work on it £25 in three months is not very encouraging, though some are doing their duty splendidly. Don't forget our cheque when you draw your next quarter's salary. We come before income tax.

FIFTEENTH LIST.

Already acknowledged	-	-	£495	0	0
Hackney Dance	-	-	6	3	0
A few sympathisers of the Licensed Vehicle Workers, per E. Fairbrother	-	-	4	0	0
Tottenham Branch	-	-	5	0	7
Book Raffle	-	-	16	0	0
N.W. London Branch	-	-	2	0	0
Islington	-	-	1	0	0
A.S., 13s; L.S., 13s.	-	-	1	6	0
A. W. Addington (Egerton, Kent)	-	-	7	6	0
T. Rimmer (Liverpool)	-	-	5	0	0
W. F. Stroud (Clapton)	-	-	5	0	0
F. M. Foan (Battersea)	-	-	2	6	0
Wm. Chitty (Tooting)	-	-	2	6	0
Mr. Owen (Battersea)	-	-	2	0	0
D. G. Fincham (Edmonton)	-	-	4	0	0
G. F. Hart (Leicester) 15; Anon, 6d.	-	-	1	6	0
Collected.	-	-	-	-	-
Sheet 309. A. M. Aedy (West Ham)	-	-	16	6	0
" 233. H. G. King	-	-	4	3	0
" 280. E. G. Pervinkler (E. Lon.)	-	-	13	0	0
" 244. G. Higgs (Walthamstow)	-	-	6	6	0
" 318. F. Mear (Birmingham)	-	-	11	6	0
" 319. E. Atkins	-	-	5	0	0
" 336. F. B. Cheshire (Manchester)	-	-	10	0	0
" 341. Tom Sala	-	-	5	0	0
Total	-	-	£520	5	4

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 1 Mattheu-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Cr ek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 74 Murdock-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham. Branch meets Sat. at Coffee House, Spicel-st.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Com'tee. Applications to General Secy.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3 Branch meets first and last Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142 Bulwar-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Siste s-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., 70 New-castle-st., Hulme Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Ex-mouth St. Schols (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High-rd., Willesden-green, N.W.10.

SOUTHEND ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy. J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communication to Secy., 207 Derinton-rd., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets Fridays at 143 Beechcroft-rd., Upper Tooting at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM. Secy. C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 51 Greenleaf-rd., Walthamstow. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday. Visitors invited.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 156 High St.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 190. Vol. 16.]

LONDON, JUNE, 1920.

[MONTHLY, TWO PENCE

ON NATIONALISATION OF THE RAILWAYS.

"THE CASE FOR NATIONALIZATION," by A. EMIL DAVIES. L.C.C. Chairman Railway Nationalization Society. London: George Allen & Unwin. Paper; 2s. 6d. nett.

In this voluminous work Mr. Davies has certainly made out a case for nationalisation as against its capitalist opponents.

What He meets their charges of extravagance with an enormous weight of evidence to the contrary. But, like all Nationalisers, he has failed to show why the workers should interest themselves in it, either as an immediate reform or as a stepping-stone toward Socialism. He has convincingly, if unconsciously, shown that Nationalisation offers nothing to the workers when he proves, as he does quite conclusively, that both Nationalisation and Municipalisation have invariably effected greater economies than similar undertakings under private enterprise. Mr. Davies admits that a more economical production results from the large concern as well as from the State concern, but he quite fails to draw the obvious conclusion.

The chief result of centralisation and better organisation is, of course, increased unemployment. The strongest proof of this is that unemployment has increased side by side with the economising processes. When concerns were small, and competing with one another, unemployment was nothing like the factor that it is to-day, when many concerns are welded into a few, able to install labour-saving machinery and effect all the economies incidental to large-scale production.

What The usual objection to Nationalisation is that it is invariably wasteful and extravagant, especially in the way of high-salaried officials. Mr. Davies shows that this is equally true of the large concerns, where enormous salaries are paid to directors and others. He gives facts and figures; he makes comparisons and builds up a case for Nationalisation as against private enterprise that is unassailable on this head. Before doing this, however, he warns the reader against expecting too much from Nationalisation while under capitalist control. He says: "Is it to be expected that men . . . opposed to the principle of community ownership which would affect the position they and their class hold, should really endeavour to make a success of government undertakings? The interests conflict too violently. If force and circumstances compel them, as it does, steadily to increase the size and number of Government undertakings, they do the best they can for their friends and class."

He Proves In spite of this handicap, however, State and Municipal concerns are proved by overwhelming evidence to be more efficient and economical than private concerns. Post Office, telegraph, telephone, railways, mines, electricity supply, banking, insurance, and many other examples from all parts of the world are shown to be financially sound according to capitalist standards and more economically worked than similar undertakings under private enterprise. In fact, so much does Mr. Davies prove in this direction that if every worker interested in the subject read the book intelligently they would all straightway become opponents to Nationalisation and its further advocacy by labour leaders.

Too It is impossible to follow our author throughout his 305 pages of argument, examples, and evidence, but one quotation will illustrate the point. He says: "In Carlisle, where the liquor

Significant Question.

Too Much.

and its further advocacy by labour leaders.

It is impossible to follow our author throughout his 305 pages of argument, examples, and evidence, but one quotation will illustrate the point. He says: "In Carlisle, where the liquor

trade has been nationalised, we are told that one brewery in the hands of the board does the work previously done by four. One spirit bottling employing 14 persons and a motor lorry does the work less efficiently performed under private enterprise by 70 men and 17 lorries.

One can easily imagine the extent to which unemployment would be increased if every State undertaking and centralised concern has been only half as successful as this. But Mr. Davies tells us that under the control of the Labour Party this economising process would be increased immensely. If he is correct it is unnecessary to go further to prove that the Labour Party is hostile to working-class interests. For if Nationalisation means that fewer workers are required to produce a given quantity of wealth, or provide a given measure of services, then the resulting increase in unemployment must, because of the intensified competition for jobs, tend to reduce the general standard of living for the working class.

Unlike most capitalist agents who deny this obvious conclusion without attempting to show wherein it is not sound, Mr. Davies recognises this weakness. He says: "It sometimes occurs that a man realises the enormous economies that can be effected by Nationalization with its centralization and administration, and the doing away of hundreds or thousands or thousands of duplicating and overlapping units of various sizes, but this very fact may cause him to ask where the doing away with all this duplication, wasteful as it is, may not result in a number of his fellows being put out of work. The first answer to this is that the gradual elimination of waste by centralisation and the formation of larger units of industry is taking place all the time by means of amalgamations and the formation of huge combines and trusts." Thus he is unable to deny that increased unemployment results from centralisation; but, because it goes on whether we like it or not, he advocates more of it! "A hair of the dog that bit him" is common-sense compared with such a misdirection of energy. While capitalism lasts the best thing that can happen to the workers is that their masters shall fail to see, or fail to introduce, economising processes, that more workers, not fewer, shall be required for the production and distribution of wealth.

It would be absurd for the workers to oppose economising processes, but they should most certainly not organise, or be led to support, them. A genuine working-class party would not waste its time and spread confusion among the workers by advocating either policy.

After the above admission by Mr. Davies he is obliged to make some attempt to solve the

unemployed problem his policy would intensify. He therefore supposes that the nationalisation of a given industry would by more economical working displace 10,000 people. "In such a case," he says, "the community would be no worse off in money if it pensioned off the whole of the 10,000 and paid them for doing nothing exactly the same wages they had been receiving." Further on he says: "Of course you would not pension off these people, but you would utilise the big saving thus brought about to reduce the hours of all the workers in the industry, to improve wages, holidays, etc., and to reduce the cost of the article, commodity or service."

In other words, instead of paying 10,000 people for doing nothing, the wages of the 10,000 would be spread over the industry, or deducted from prices.

Our author's second proposition is almost as impossible of application as the first, because, in the first place, he concedes to the capitalist the privilege of continuing to draw dividends, disguised, it is true, as interest on bonds or loans. This interest must be paid out of the profits of the industry, and, consequently imposes at once the conditions that are most economical. In those services that have already been nationalised there is no such shortening of hours and improvement of conditions. State and municipal employees are no better off than other workers. In one respect some of them are worse off. When the State is the only employer in an industry the order of the "sack" becomes a serious matter, as the late police strike shows.

According to Mr. Davies, however, all these obstacles will be swept away when the Labour Party controls. But until the Labour Party can disprove the current belief among the workers generally, that extravagant working of nationalised services is a burden on them, they will fail to obtain the necessary sanction and support to carry them through. The working class can no more move towards vastly improved conditions sectionally than the capitalist class can be forced, sectionally, from their dominant position.

All Mr. Davies' schemes are based on the retention of the wages system, on the creation of surplus-value by the workers which an idle class will continue to appropriate and share. All his schemes get us no nearer to the abolition of the wages system; time passes, it is true, but time that would be far better spent in working for Socialism.

Nationalisation cranks are forced to admit that not all industries are fit subjects for State control. Some of them realise that certain industries and services are easily nationalised because

the majority of capitalists are more or less dependent on them and could control them more effectively in their own interests through the State machinery.

Mr. Davies devotes a good deal of space to proving that other individuals and parties, besides the Labour Party, will, if it suits their interests, carry out Nationalisation projects. He says, for instance, "If Nationalization is necessary to keep Mr. Lloyd George in office, he will no doubt declare himself in favour of it." Of so little importance is it, even to the capitalist class, that its adoption can hang on the personal ambition of one capitalist statesman.

Mr. Davies quotes a number of prominent Liberals in favour of Nationalisation, and incidentally calls attention to the "break-up" of the Liberal Party. He says the Liberals of the "strongly individualist type will go over to the Tories, the rest will form a right wing of the Labour Party. They will be extremely valuable in a party that is growing rapidly and sadly needs an accession of strength in the shape of persons of parliamentary experience and debating skill."

Thus like all the labour crowd, our author is always prepared to compromise with the enemies of the workers to obtain objects only of value to the master class. He fails to see that the weakness of the Labour Party is entirely due to their failure to take up the Socialist position.

The workers, when considering Nationalisation, should not forget the lessons of the war. Government control, or Nationalisation, was the step taken by the executive power in order to economise in men, materials, and transport, so that the largest possible number of men might be available for the fighting line. In peace time, however, the men who would be displaced would merely swell the unemployed army and help to bring down wages.

Mr. Davies is so deeply concerned that the capitalist shall not suffer by Nationalisation that he devotes a good deal of space to the elaboration of schemes that would ensure to them a fixed rate of interest for a number of years with their capital intact at the end. He should listen to an ordinary House of Commons debate on unemployment, and if he has any sense of comparison his absurd consideration for a class that lives by robbery would vanish. With the Socialist it is not a question of compensation, but restoration.

The absurdity of working-class action for Nationalisation is apparent. Besides the enormous increase in unemployment admitted by Mr. Davies the supreme objection remains: the wages system is to be retained. There has never been any advocate of Nationalisation

sufficiently clear-sighted to recognise that before any improvement can possibly take place in the condition of the working class the wages system must be abolished. No system can be satisfactory to the intelligent workers that does not live in luxury on their backs. Nationalisation does not exclude all possibility of an idle class continuing to compete with each other in a world market and paying interest to a class of idlers is merely a modified form of capitalism, possibly its highest form, dominating and exploiting even more ruthlessly than at present. Whether Labour's blind—or corrupt—leaders succeed in establishing it or not, the workers' historic mission still lies before them. They must organise to own and control the means of wealth production in their own interests, and not to create either dividends or interest for an idle class.

F. F.

BY THE WAY.

It is an interesting study to the detached observer to look around and see how the "props" of England's greatness and the capitalist politicians work up their various stunts, incidentally, of course, contradicting one another time after time.

During the war we were all urged to join in our masters' quarrel and wage "the war to end war," with the promise that when this had been terminated the "world would be safe for democracy." How safe it has become will be easily perceived even by those who have only one eye.

Speaking a short time ago at Portsmouth, Major-General Seely told his hearers what a glorious thing is capitalist society, how under its aegis the inventive genius of man had developed, and what the future held in store for those who remained in this beautiful world of capitalism. He said—

... if the world was plunged into a world war in the years to come, it was quite certain that the whole of civilisation would be involved in the terrible destruction of life which modern science had rendered possible. It would not be eight million men killed, but far more than that, for great portions of their civilization—men, women, and children—would be wiped out of existence in the first few weeks of the war.—"Daily News," March 9th, 1920.

After this all the stories of the "red" peril and atrocity-mongering campaigners leave us cold. The only way to end war and make the world safe for the people is to wage the class war for the abolition of classes and the private ownership of the means of life. On which side do you stand? Are you a supporter of capitalism and all the horrors which it stands for, or

are you with the ever-growing band of tailors who seek the world for the workers? Think it over!

Coming to a more recent date one finds a report that Field-Marshal Sir Henry Wilson, speaking at the annual meeting of the Union Jack Club, said that we had been told we went into the war to end war.

If one might pause here for a moment it will be easy to recall that six years ago the politician, parson, press, and militarist all joined in the theme of Belgium and the Scrap of Paper. Then it was a case of "our" plighted word and righteous indignation at Germany's violation of Belgian neutrality. To-day it is a new S.O.S.—save our skins.

However, to return to the concluding portion of the Field-Marshal's observations, let me remind all of you who have been enlisted or deemed to have been enlisted that our warrior bold says—

I hope you men, to whatever branch of the service you belong, will do all you can to keep fit and ready for the time that is coming. Except in August 1914, our country and our Empire have never wanted you more. We are living in ticklish and dangerous times, and our command on sea, on land, and in the air is being challenged in various parts of the world. I hope you will carry this—warning if you like—away with you from a very old soldier who knows what he is talking about.—"Daily News," May 19th, 1920.

Perhaps it is fortunate that the remarks made above were in the present tense and not the past, but still they are interesting to those who have been or have been deemed to have been, in which case, from my observations, they will say, "No thanks, old bean."

Ministerial answers to questions in the House of Commons are full of interest to those whose outlook is larger than that of those who regularly peruse the columns of the noonday "Star." Quite recently a number of questions were asked concerning Poland, and whether the Allies were giving the Poles "moral or material support," either in "money or munitions." To which Mr. Bonar Law replied: The answer is in the negative so far as concerns His Majesty's Government.

Some days later the same gentleman, in answer to a further question on the subject, admitted that in October last the British Government offered to supply a certain quantity of surplus stores, part of which was now being shipped. Apart from that no assistance had been or was being given to the Polish Government.

Mr. Barnes asked whether the position was not now different, having regard to the declarations of

the Prime Minister made more recently than October last.

Mr. Bonar Law: Yes; but as a matter of fact the bargain was made and the material was actually given to the Polish Government. It is their property, and to have gone back upon it would have been to break our bond.—"Daily News," May 18th, 1920.

Evidently the right honourable gentleman has more regard for "our bond" than his conflicting replies, which savour of equivocation.

The following remark, made by one who is supposed to be a disciple of the lowly Nazarene, is, I think, worth recording—

I feel that the presence of children from a late enemy country would make it more difficult to bring people back to the charitable and Christian frame of mind which one desires should mark the arrival of peace.—Rector of Bexhill.—"Daily News," May 12th, 1920.

Evidently this Holy Joe has forgotten his master's injunction when he said, "Feed my lambs."

Some of the labour leaders, who have been designated by the supporters of capitalism of the "same" variety inasmuch as they approximate unto them, have had a rather rough time during the May-Day festivities. It is somewhat unfortunate that they were shouted down. But the fact that the rank and file are at last keeping their optics on these gentry is all to the good.

According to that organ of light and learning, the "Weekly Dispatch," (2.5.1920) we gather that "Mr. J. Sexton, M.P., was continually interrupted, epithets such as 'Liar,' 'Traitor,' being shouted."

Again we read that "Mr. J. Clynes had a stormy reception at Manchester, being booed and hissed and told to sit down. . . . When he turned to general labour topics the audience broke into 'Tell me the old, old story' and it was some minutes before he could proceed."

THE SCOUT.

NOTICES.

The attention of comrades is drawn to the fact that we are running an Economic Class at the Head Office. The class meets every Thursday at 8 p.m.

We have received a request for some back numbers of the SOCIALIST STANDARD to complete a file for the New South Wales (Australia) Reference and Research Library. Can any reader oblige with copies of issues prior to 1911?

PURBLIND SAMSON.

There is one fact that impresses an observer of social life in the 20th century very forcibly, amidst all the gigantic progress of Science evinced in the harnessing and utilisation of the forces of Nature. This paramount fact is the active power and potentialities of the proletariat. The working class, in fact, is not only all-important, but, with education and organisation on class-conscious lines, will ultimately be all-powerful.

The workers, as a class, know not yet their own colossal might. Alone producing all the wealth of the world, the very fabric of society is maintained by their active energies of mind and hands.

A section of them strike, and the withholding of their labour frequently disorganises industry. Many sections strike concurrently, the wheels of production cease to revolve, and a serious crisis is precipitated. Labour, the mighty Samson, has not yet learnt his strength.

For the truth is that though the scales are slowly falling from his eyes, he still suffers with dimness of vision—is, in fact, a purblind Sampson!

The working class, indeed, is made up of those whose political and economic vision varies very considerably. Very many are as yet blind to the realities of the capitalist system; they do not understand that they are wage-slaves to those who own the means of life of society; they do not see that they are robbed by means of the wages system of most of the wealth they have produced and continue to produce. Not understanding the essentials of capitalist production, they fail to understand Socialism, or even the need for it. In fact, with docility and diligence they "mark time" for their masters like automata.

As time goes on the class struggle itself, in which the workers are involved, is performing a wondrous operation upon them, for they are suffering through the inevitable evils of capitalism—unemployment, pitiable wages, and chronic poverty. At the mercy of their exploiters and profiteers they frantically turn this way and that to cope with the evils of capitalism, and out of unwisdom try futilely to set things straight. But the SYSTEM that produces their sufferings they do not dream of attacking! They see neither a definite goal, nor the way to it.

Yet a small minority there is who, by experience, thought, and study, are clear-sighted enough to see the way before them. These are the class-conscious and revolutionary proletarians. They know that no palliatives or

tinkering reforms of any kind will, or can, remove the blighting effects of the present system or emancipate their class from wage-slavery.

Only the destruction of capitalism itself, and the establishment by the workers of the Socialist Commonwealth in its place ever can—and it inevitably will. And this they know can be proved by a series of irrefutable facts—a perfect arsenal of scientific proofs, historic, material, economic, and political.

We have seen, during the last few years particularly, an accentuated and ever-increasing class-struggle, growing out of the essential antagonism between the wealth-producing workers and their exploiters. And that conflict of interests produces an increased class-consciousness in some, whilst it illuminates and reveals for others the essential clash of the classes that is the outcome of the capitalist system, and of which they probably had not been otherwise aware.

Also the development of a predatory and ruthless system of capitalism automatically not only produces its antagonists, but drives them to combat it. And the result is that weapon after weapon will be tried and discarded—because they are no good.

Syndicalism, Direct Action, Industrial Unionism, etc.—what are these but names of various forms of pathetic futility?

Co-partnership is a childish scheme in that it does not even aim at the abolition of the exploitation of the worker, and only increases his servile relationship to his "altruistic" employer. The Trade Unions are used by the capitalist class as instruments by which, through treacherous and lying Labour "leaders," the clamour of their members for better wages and conditions of labour can most effectively be suppressed.

At the best the function of the Trade Unions is simply that of collectively bargaining for a better price for their members' labour-power, and better conditions, not to abolish the system under which they are daily robbed.

It all finally reduces down to the matter of class-consciousness—an exact knowledge of their position, importance, and potentialities, on the part of the workers AS A CLASS in relation to society as a whole, and especially to the capitalist class, to whom they stand as propertyless, wealth-producing slaves.

Class-consciousness must be the basis of all revolutionary political action, and it is a tremendous driving force, wherever it is developed. It germinates from a mixture of experience and the study of Marxian economics.

Without class-consciousness as arriving force all the varied activities of the proletariat

to better their conditions must necessarily be weakened in power.

Our exploiters, the capitalist class, hold, and will continue to keep as long as they can, the whole edifice of society as a means to conserve and further their own class interests. It is only because they have the POLITICAL POWER that they wield such force as they do.

Shorn of that, their parasite-hold on society at once relaxes—they are hurled from their position of dominance.

But whilst they are in possession of the political means of "Law and Order" they not only make the laws in their own class interest, but will have them enforced if necessary by the Army, Navy, and Police.

It is obvious, then, that no action whatever on the part of the long oppressed proletariat will emancipate the workers from wage-slavery other than the capture of political power for the purpose of overthrowing capitalism and establishing Socialism. All else is blind battling with temporary evils, and a mere beating of the air.

Labour, the purblind Samson, uses but a tiny bit of his strength. At present he lacks vision. Education in Socialist principles, political and economic experience will act as goads. Then, organised on the economic field, and on the political field for the capture and control of the machinery of government, he will use his Titanic power for the overthrow of capitalism and the upbuilding in its place of the Socialist Commonwealth. He will have seen the slavery of his class and all that he is robbed of; he will see that SOCIALISM is the only hope of the workers, and he will not be satisfied till it is established.

GRAHAM MAY.

READY SHORTLY.

MANIFESTO

OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.
SIXTH EDITION,
WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P.,
I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions,
S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence.

Post free, 3½d. per copy, from the S.P.G.B.,
17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

THE BLINDNESS OF THE WORKERS.

In one of the world's great novels, Dickens's "David Copperfield," occurs the following passage, [the poignant significance of which appears to have been overlooked by the majority of even the most assiduous Dickensian students: "There was a beggar in the street, when I went down: and as I turned my head towards the window, thinking of her calm seraphic eyes, he made me start by muttering, as if he were (an echo of the morning: 'Blind! Blind! Blind!']"

Whether Dickens realised the almost universal application of what he had written is a matter of conjecture. Probably all he had in mind was its application to the particular set of characters with which he happened at the moment to be dealing. But to the Socialist, looking around at the world as it is to-day, seeing the foolishness, the illusions, the ignorance, which go to make up the mentality of so many men and women, it would seem as though a film had fallen across the eyes of his fellow-workers, causing either what amounts to total mental blindness or to so distorted a vision as to preclude any possibility of the realities of life being seen in their true perspective.

We could adduce many facts to show how mentally blind the working-class people of the world are. At the outbreak of the late war, for example, the people of this country (and of all other belligerent countries) who up to that date had, and desired, no quarrel with their reputed enemies, were so blinded by the wave of patriotism that swept over them, originated as it had been by the training and teaching they had received in childhood and youth, encouraged as it was by the insidious propaganda instigated from press, platform, and pulpit, that thousands, hundreds of thousands, of them clamoured for permission to kill and be killed in what they thought was the interest of their country, by which they meant, one presumes, their own interest.

Needless to say, permission to so kill and be killed was graciously conceded by their masters and accepted by the poor, deluded fools who, not understanding their class position as wage-slaves, not knowing what was at the bottom of the whole bloody business, thought in their blind folly that they were doing something noble and heroic, thought that they were fighting and dying to save for themselves and their descendants what they considered their freedom, to save their "national heritage," their "share in the Empire," their womenfolk and children from the bestiality and oppression

which they were quite convinced would be their fate were the forces against which they were fighting to prove successful.

They could not see that the war was simply a struggle generated by rival groups of capitalists for the possession of certain favourable (from the commercial point of view) portions of the earth's surface. They could not all see that the only freedom they, as members of the working class, possessed was the freedom either to starve or allow themselves to be exploited for profit by their employers. They could not see that their only heritage, national or otherwise, was the lifelong heritage of hard and sordid work (when they were not unemployed) nor that their "share in the Empire" had no substance in fact, but was only a magniloquent phrase very useful to politicians at election times for purposes of vote-catching. They could not see that their womenfolk and children were, and always had been, the drudges, the toys, the slaves of a system whose bestiality and oppression had never been equalled since the dawn of the world's history. They fought, and died, and were maimed, for—what? For an illusion which had been given a semblance of reality by the vicious teaching and smart word-spinning of innumerable capitalist agents. The people fought and died in their millions and the net result is that, from a materialist standpoint, they are still struggling to rise to the very poor level at which they stood prior to the war.

Again, when we come to examine the attitude of the workers in regard to their political representation, we find how in a similar way the blindness of the people operates. At the last General Election they were, in the main, carried away by what they considered was the need for stabilising the "fruits of victory"—one of the pet phrases of the war rhetoricians—and voted practically solid for the Coalitionists. They have since tasted some of the "fruits of victory," and found the taste not altogether to their liking; so at the subsequent bye-elections they have largely voted in even a worse and more foolish way; that is, they have voted for the "Labour" candidates.

Doubtless exception will be taken, in some cases, to the statement that it is more foolish to vote for a Labour man than for a Coalitionist. But when one considers the confusion caused by these Labour misleaders, these advocates of reforms which they must know are useless and worse than useless to the workers, these mouthers of phrases full of the most fatuous cant and sentimentality, the writer is justified, he thinks, in his antagonism towards them and his statement as to the enormous harm they do. All these men seem to consider is how best to get into Parliament so that by virtue of the

magic letters "M.P." after their names they may be able to draw their salaries of £400 a year, to serve (for a monetary consideration) on Committees and Commissions; to obtain well-paid jobs on capitalist newspapers and magazines. How these activities benefit their working-class constituents it is impossible to fathom. As a matter of fact, neither they nor anyone else can benefit the working class. The working class, as we continually reiterate, must work out its own emancipation. The veil of illusion must be torn away from before the eyes of the workers, and this will only come about as the facts of life bite deeper and still deeper into their mentality, and as the unwearied propagandist work of the Socialist Party comes more and more to fruition.

We do not blame the workers for their blindness to their own interests. Indeed, the question of blaming or praising anyone or anything does not enter into the Socialist philosophy. What we endeavour to do is to open their eyes to the facts appertaining to capitalism and the logical deductions to be drawn from such facts.

The Socialist may claim to be the oculist of the working class. His aim is to give sight to those of his fellow-workers who are wandering in the darkness of capitalist orthodoxy. So the work the Socialist Party has in hand—the work of making Socialists—must go on until a majority of the people see eye to eye with us and organise themselves with us in one united political party. Then, and not till then, we shall know that the dawn of the Socialist day is near, wherein the potentialities of life will, at last, have an opportunity of developing on sane and healthy lines instead of being forced into a groove of insane and unhealthy activities which are all the present system of capitalism can afford to its wage-slaves.

F. J. WEBB.

Inquirers are informed that the new edition of the Party Manifesto is well forward, and will be on sale shortly. We regret the delay, which is due to causes beyond our control.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

The Materialist Concept not only furnishes us with the key to the past development of society, but also to its future direction. It shows us wither society is tending and enables to adjust our actions accordingly. It shows us the "earthly core of misty creations" and keeps us out of the tortuous ways of the metaphysician. In other words, it compels us to be practical scientists instead of abstract dreamers.

GILMAC.

(To be Continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

We have received a letter from Mr. J. Chelsom stating that, while he agrees with most of our Declaration of Principles, he cannot subscribe to the last clause, where we define our hostility to other parties.

He asks us to justify our attitude. Also he considers that we would not be sacrificing any principle if we joined with "other working-class parties" if we always stated our case on Reforms and either voted against the Reforms or abstained from voting. He thinks that a refusal of admittance by the Labour Party, or, having joined, our expulsion from that body (he does not say on what ground) would put us in a stronger and more logical position than we hold at present. Further on he says "hostility can be best proved by combatting first hand that which is retarding Socialism."

It is interesting to note how people can often accept premises and yet refuse to adopt the only logical conclusion that can be drawn from those premises.

If Mr. Chelsom accepts clause six of our Declaration of Principles, it is difficult to see how he can find fault with clause eight, as the latter merely defines a line of action laid down as necessary by the former.

To achieve its emancipation the working class, when equipped with the necessary knowledge, must capture political power. For this purpose it must organise into a political party to fight for this control of power on its own behalf. Any other use of political organisation necessarily means the retention, or extension, of the political power of the masters. Because of this simple fact, a working-class political party striving for the emancipation of the workers must oppose all supporters of capitalism, or stand condemned as a fraud.

Mr. Chelsom is quite in error in supposing that the chief crime of the Labour Party is the advocacy of reforms. The great central treachery of the Labour Party is its urging the working class to vote capitalist candidates into political power, and its various bargains for seats in

Parliament on the basis of exchange of support. This treachery is also practised by other so-called workers' parties (the I.L.P., B.S.P., N.S.P., etc.), as Mr. Chelsom is very well aware, because he has read the SOCIALIST STANDARD for several years, in which we have given overwhelming proof of the truth of our charges.

Yet, after condemning what he, wrongly, calls our "separatism," Mr. Chelsom states that "hostility can be best proved by combatting first hand that which is retarding Socialism." Now this being exactly what we do, it is puzzling to find our correspondent condemning us for carrying out a policy which he supports. Far from standing apart and watching the struggle from a distance as he suggests, we attack "first hand" at every opportunity we get, those who are retarding Socialism.

To give an instance that will, no doubt, still be fresh in Mr. Chelsom's mind; in the October 1919 "S.S." we attacked the various Labour leaders who were urging the workers to increase production. In "Reynolds's Newspaper" for November 31th 1919 Mr. Clynes tried to combat our attack and quoted from our article, though he did not mention our paper by name. His "reply" was pulverised in our issue of December last, and, later on, for some special reason, Mr. Clynes contradicted in Parliament the case he had tried to make in "Reynolds's."

It seems as though Mr. Chelsom has been misled by the revolutionary-sounding phrases that many of the Labour leaders are ready to use at particular meetings, or else, like many other workers, he fancies that because an organisation is composed in the main of working men and women, it is therefore anti-capitalist in character and action. But the phrases of the Labour leaders are contradicted by their actions which we have exposed so often, while on the second point it is too often forgotten that every political party depends upon the working class for its actual power. Even so aristocratic and reactionary a body as the Primrose League depends for its political power upon the agricultural labourers. If we can join hands with one set of supporters of capitalism why not with another? Where are we to draw the line?

The B.S.P. just now is supporting "Soviets" and "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and defending Russia, while remaining a part of the Labour Party that helped to place in power a Government that is doing so much to overthrow the Russian Soviet Republic! Such action simply makes confusion worse confounded.

The line is already clearly drawn in all developed capitalist countries. Every party, no matter who compose its membership, that assists the masters to retain political power, under any pretext whatever, thereby proves

itself an anti-Socialist party. It must, therefore, be fought by the Socialist Party of that country.

That is our position and work in Great Britain. We are the only party in this country that organises for the capture of political power by the working class, for its emancipation. To join with those who are working against this capture of power would be sheer idiocy. We, therefore, combat them all "first hand" because that is the only logical conclusion that can be drawn from Socialist principles. ED. COM.

HOW TO SAVE THE CHILDREN.

Anomalous as it may sound, Sentiment and Cruelty are very closely akin, and although we may perhaps give our short-sighted humanitarians credit for a real desire to alleviate the sufferings of the babies of Central Europe we cannot but recognise that their charity in its present form tends only to prolong the sufferings of the wage-workers' children all the world over. The root cause of the problem of starving Europe is the ownership of the means of wealth production by one small section of society. There is no shortage of food actually. Nature has not failed us. But the promoters of the "Save the Children" movement do not understand this. Their notions are capitalist notions. To them all is well with the world except that five million little Austrians are in danger of a terrible death. But have they never walked, say for instance, through a Lancashire industrial centre? There they would see children distorted in limbs, stunted in growth, faces and eyes eaten by disease, and covered with grime and dirt. Capitalism chains their mothers to toil throughout the long day with the result that the children go neglected. In some places it is the custom for one of the elder children to bring the latest unweaned baby to the factory gates at certain stipulated hours so that the mother may leave her work for a short while to suckle it. Under capitalism the children of the workers are but potential wage-slaves. Their happiness does not count. It is nothing new to us to learn that some children somewhere are being starved to death. In New York, London, Paris, Rome, in fact, everywhere where capitalism exists children are starved and will continue to starve.

Our leading article last month pointed out the failure of capitalism to solve the problem of starvation. There is, therefore, only one method left. That is the Socialist method—the abolition of capitalism. Send all the foodships you may and you but abrogate the misery of but an infinitesimal number of those who suffer.

And what is more, the position must worsen as capitalism reaches its final stage of development. The sooner you realise that the sooner will you desire to end it. Does it need those heart-rending photographs we have been seeing lately, of children, emaciated and twisted beyond recognition with rickets, to bring home to you the rottenness and vile inhumanity of the system you tolerate? Do you plead ignorance of the misery and squalor that must confront you every day of your lives? We cannot believe that. All the world knows that Queen Alexandra has got something in her eye or that President Deschanel fell out of the train in his pyjamas. Why, then, does not all the world display an equal interest in the wrongs that little children, and their parents, are subjected to in every part of the globe?

Thus we tell you that we are the only ones that can save the starving children, and we cannot do that without your support. Your charitable ladies of a generation hence will be appealing for starving babies to be fed, just as they are to-day, just as they were a generation ago.

If, therefore, it hurts you to see babies die a terrible death; if it even hurts you to see them live terrible lives, your duty is plain. That is to wipe out the system which is responsible and to establish in its place a system that will mean security of life for the individual from the cradle to the grave.

And if you must contribute to a fund for starving children, that fund and the only really effective fund is the Socialist Party's £1,000 Fund. S. H. S.

BLIND!

There is a wail that breaks upon our hearing;
A mournful whisper borne upon the wind;
A sightless army through the night is steering,
Blind! Blind! Blind!

Eyes that are blind to life and life's awakening,
What do you seek and what expect to find?
A world new-born without your aid in making?
Blind! Blind! Blind!

'Tis you yourselves who must through toil and sorrow,

Loosen the chains your minds and bodies bind.
Think you that we can build the new tomorrow?

Blind! Blind! Blind!

When you shall rend the veil that seeks to blind you,

When to the winds your old-time dreams are hurled,

Then shall you break the fetters that now bind you

And win the world.

F. G. WEBB.

THE HISTORICAL METHOD OF MARX.

REPRINTED FROM THE "INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW,"

OCT., 1907.

II.

Deistic and Idealistic Philosophies of History—Continued.

But to show the progressive development of the bourgeoisie for a certain number of centuries back does not explain that historic movement any more than to trace the curve described in falling by a stone thrown into the air teaches us the cause of its fall. The philosophic historians attribute this evolution to the ceaseless action of the Spiritual Forces, particularly Justice, the strongest of all, which according to an idealistic and academic philosopher, "is always present even though it arrives only by degrees into human thought and into social facts." Bourgeois society and its way of thinking are thus the last and highest manifestations of this immanent Justice, and it is to obtain these fine results that this lady has toiled in the mines of history.

Let us consult the judicial records of the lady aforesaid for information on her character and manners.

A ruling class always considers that what serves its economic and political interests is just and that what disservices them is unjust. The Justice which it conceives is realised when its class interests are satisfied. The interests of the bourgeoisie are thus the guides of bourgeois justice, as the interests of the aristocracy were those of feudal justice. Thus, through unconscious irony, Justice is pictured blindfolded that she may not see the mean and sordid interests which she protects with her aegis.

The feudal and guild organisation, injuring the bourgeoisie, was in its eyes so unjust that its immanent Justice resolved to destroy it. The bourgeois historians relate that it could not tolerate the forcible robberies of the feudal barons, who knew no other methods of rounding out their fields and filling their purses. All of which does not prevent their honest immanent Justice from encouraging the forcible robberies which, without risking their skins, the pacific capitalists have committed by proletarians disguised as soldiers in the barbarous countries of the old and the new world. It is not that this sort of theft pleases the virtuous lady; she solemnly approves and authorises, with all legal sanctions, only the economic theft which, without clamorous violence, the bour-

geoisie daily commits on the wage worker. Economic theft is so perfectly suited to the temperament and character of Justice that she metamorphoses herself into a watchdog over bourgeois wealth because it is an accumulation of thefts as legal as they are just.

Justice, who, as the philosophers say, has done marvellously in the past, who reigns in bourgeois society and who leads men toward a future of peace and happiness, is on the contrary the fertile mother of social iniquities. It is Justice who gave the slaveholder the right to possess man like a chattel; it is she again who gives the capitalist the right to exploit the children, women and men of the proletariat worse than beasts of burden. It is Justice who permitted the slaveholder to chastise the slave, who hardened his heart when he lacerated him with blows. It is she again who authorises the capitalist to grasp the surplus value created by the wage worker, and who puts his conscience at rest when he rewards with starvation wages the labour which enriches him. I stand on my right, said the slaveholder when he lashed the slave; I stand on my right, says the capitalist when he steals from the wage worker the fruits of his labour.

The capitalist class, measuring everything by its own standards, decorates with the name of Civilisation and Humanity its social order and manner of treating human beings. It is only to export civilisation to the barbarous nations, only to rescue them from their gross immorality, only to ameliorate their miserable conditions of existence that it undertakes its colonial expeditions, and its Civilisation and its Humanity manifest themselves under the specific form of stupefaction through Christianity, poisoning with alcohol, pillage and extermination of the natives. But we should be doing an injustice if we thought that it favours the barbarians and that it does not diffuse the benefits of its Humanity over the labouring classes of the nations which it rules. Its Civilisation and its Humanity may there be counted up by the mass of men, women and children dispossessed of all property, condemned to compulsory labour day and night, to periodical vacations at their own expense, to alcoholism, consumption, rickets; by the increasing number of misdemeanors and crimes, by the multiplication of insane asylums and by the development and improvement of the penitentiary system.

Never has ruling class so loudly clamoured for the Ideal, because never had a ruling class had such need for obscuring its actions with idealistic chatter. This ideological charlatanism is its surest and most efficacious method for political and economic trickery. The startling contradiction between its words and its acts has

III.

Vico's "Historical Laws."

Vico, scarcely ever read by the philosophical historians, although they play with a few of his phrases, which they interpret badly as often as they repeat them, formulated in his *Scienza nuova* certain fundamental laws of history.

He lays down as a general law of the development of societies that all nations, whatever their ethnic origin and their geographical habitat, traverse the same historic roads; thus, the history of any nation whatever is a repetition of the history of another nation which has attained a higher degree of development.

"There exists," he says, "an eternal ideal history traversed on earth by the histories of all nations, from whatever status of savagery, barbarism and ferocity men set out to civilize themselves, to domesticate themselves, according to his expression. (*Scienza nuova*; libr. II, § 5.)

Morgan, who probably had no knowledge of Vico, arrived at a conception of the same law which he formulates in a more positive and complete fashion. The historic uniformity which the Neopolitan philosopher attributed to their development according to a pre-established plan the American anthropologist assigns to two causes, to the intellectual resemblance of men and to the similarity of the obstacles which they have had to surmount in order to develop their societies. Vico also believed in their intellectual resemblance. "There necessarily exists," he said, "in the nature of human affairs, a universal mental language, common to all nations, which designs uniformly the substance of the things playing an active part in the social life of men and expresses it with as many modifications as there are different aspects which these things can take on. We recognise its existence in proverbs, those maxims of popular wisdom, which are of the same substance in all nations, ancient and modern, although they are expressed in so many different ways." (*Ib Degli Elem.* XXII.)

"The human mind," says Morgan, "specifically the same in all the tribes and nations of mankind, and limited in the range of its powers, works and must work, in the same uniform channels, and within narrow limits of variation. Its results in disconnected regions of space, and in widely separated ages of time, articulate in a logically connected chain of common experiences." Elsewhere in this book Morgan shows that, like successive geological formations, the tribes of humanity may be superimposed in successive layers according to their development: classed in this way, they reveal with a certain degree of exactness the complete march

not prevented the historians and philosophers from taking the eternal Ideas and Principles for the sole motive forces of the history of the capitalised nations. Their monumental error, which passes all bounds even for the intellectuals, is an incontestable proof of the power wielded by Ideas, and of the adroitness with which the bourgeoisie has succeeded in cultivating and exploiting this force so as to derive an income from it. The financiers pad their prospectuses with patriotic principles, with ideas of civilisation, humanitarian sentiments, and 'six-per-cent. investments for fathers of families. These are infallible baits when fishing for suckers. De Lesseps could never have inflated his magnificent bubble at Panama, raking in the savings of eight hundred thousand little people, had not that "great Frenchman" promised to add another glory to the halo of his Fatherland, to broaden civilised humanity and to enrich the subscribers.

Eternal Ideas and Principles are such irresistible attractions that there is no financial, industrial, or commercial prospectus, nor even an advertisement of alcoholic drink or patent medicine, but is spiced with it; political treasons and economic frauds hoist the standard of Ideas and Principles.

The historic philosophy of the idealists could not be other than a war of words, equally insipid and indigestible, since they have not perceived that the capitalist parades the eternal principles for no other purpose than to mask the egoistic motives of his actions, and since they have not arrived at the point of recognising the humbug of the bourgeois ideology. But the lamentable abortions of the idealist philosophy do not prove that it is impossible to arrive at the determining causes of the organisation and evolution of human societies as the chemists have succeeded in doing with those which regulate the agglomeration of molecules into complex bodies.

"The social world," says Vico, the father of the philosophy of history, "is undeniably the work of man, whence it results that we may and must find its principles nowhere else than in the modification of human intelligence. Is it not surprising to every thinking man that the philosophers have seriously undertaken to know the world of nature, which God made and the knowledge of which He has reserved for Himself, and that they have neglected to meditate over that social world, the knowledge of which men may have, since men have made it?"

The numerous failures of the deistic and idealistic methods compel the trial of a new method of interpreting history.

of human progress from savagery to civilization; for the paths of human experiences in the several nations have been almost parallel. Marx, who studied the path of economic "experiences," confirms Morgan's idea. The country most developed industrially, he says in the preface to "Capital," shows those who follow it on the industrial ladder the image of their own future.

Thus, then, the "ideal eternal history" which according to Vico the different peoples of humanity must traverse each in their turn, is not an historic plan pre-established by a divine intelligence, but an historic plan of human progress conceived by the historian who, after having studied the stages traversed by every people, compares them in progressive series according to their degrees of complexity.

Researches, continued for a century on the savage tribes and ancient and modern peoples, have triumphantly proved the exactness of Vico's law. They have established the fact that all men, whatever their ethnic origin or their geographical habitat, had in their development gone through the same forms of family, property, and production, as well as the social and political institutions. The Danish anthropologists were the first to recognise the fact and to divide the prehistoric period into successive ages of stone, bronze, and iron, characterised by the raw material of the tools manufactured and consequently of the mode of production. The general histories of the different nations, whether they belong to the white, black, yellow or red race, and whether they inhabit the temperate zone, the equator or the poles, are distinguished from each other only by Vico's stage of ideal history, only by Morgan's historic stratum, only by Marx's round of the economic ladder to which they have attained. Thus the most developed people shows to those which are less developed the image of their own future.

The productions of intelligence do not escape Vico's law. The philologists and grammarians have found that for the creation of words and languages men of all races have followed the same rules. Folklorists have gathered the same tales among savage and civilised peoples. Vico had already recognised among them the same proverbs. Many of the folklorists instead of considering the similar tales as the productions of nations which preserve them only through oral tradition think that they were conceived in only one centre, from which they were scattered over the earth. This is inadmissible and contradicts what has been observed in the social institutions and other productions, intellectual as well as material.

The history of the idea of the soul and the ideas to which it has given birth is one of the

most curious examples of the remarkable uniformity of the development of thought. The idea of the soul, which is found in savages, even the lowest, is one of the first intellectual inventions. The soul once invented, it was necessary so fit it out with a dwelling place, under the earth or in the sky, to lodge after death, in order to prevent it from wandering without domicile and pestering the living. The idea of the soul, very vivid in savage and barbarous nations, after having contributed to the manufacture of the idea of the Great Spirit and of God, vanishes among nations arrived at a higher degree of development, to be reborn with a new life and force when they arrive at another stage of evolution. The historians, after having pointed out in the historic nations of the Mediterranean basin the absence of the idea of the soul, which nevertheless had existed among them during the preceding savage period, recognise its rebirth some centuries before the Christian era, as well as its persistence until our own days. They content themselves with mentioning these extraordinary phenomena of the disappearance and reappearance of so fundamental an idea without attaching importance to them and without thinking of looking for the explanation which, however, they would not have found in the field of their investigations, and which we can only hope to discover by applying Marx's historical method, by seeking it in the transformations of the economic world.

The scientists who have brought to light the primitive forms of the family, property, and political institutions, have been too much absorbed by the labour of research to have time to enquire into the causes of their transformations: they have only made descriptive history, and the science of the social world must be explanatory as well as descriptive.

Vico thinks that man is the unconscious motive power of history and that it is not his virtues but his vices which are the active forces. It is not "disinterestedness, generosity, and humanity, but ferocity, avarice, and ambition" which create and develop societies; "these three vices which lead the human race astray, produce the army, commerce, and political power, and consequently the courage, wealth, and wisdom of republics: so that these vices, which are capable of destroying the human race on earth, produce civil felicity."

This unexpected result furnished to Vico the proof of "the existence of a divine providence, a divine intelligence, which, out of the passions of men, absorbed entirely by their private interests, which might make them live in solitudes like fierce beasts, organises civil order, thus permitting us to live in a human society."

The divine providence which directs the evil passions of men is a second edition of the popular axiom: "man proposes and God disposes. This divine providence of the Neapolitan philosopher and this God of popular wisdom who leads man by the aid of his vices and his passions, what are they?"

The mode of production, says Marx.

Vico, in accordance with the popular judgment, affirms that man alone furnishes the motive power of history. But his passions, bad and good, and his needs are not invariable quantities as the idealists suppose, for whom man has remained always the same. For example, maternal love, that heritage from the animals, without which man in the savage state could not have lived and perpetuated himself, diminishes in civilization to the point of disappearing in the mothers of the rich class, who from its birth relieve themselves of the child and entrust it to the care of hirelings;—other civilized women feel so little the need of maternity that they make vows of virginity;* paternal love and sexual jealousy, which cannot show themselves in savage and barbarous tribes during the polyandrous period, are on the contrary highly developed among civilized people;—the sentiment of equality, vivid and imperious in savages and barbarians, who live in communities, to the point of forbidding any one the possession of an object which the others could not possess, has become so fully obliterated since man has lived under the system of individual property, that the poor and the wage workers of civilization accept resignedly and as a divine and natural destiny their social inferiority.

Thus, then, in the course of human development, fundamental passions are transformed, reduced, and extinguished, while others arise and grow. To seek only in man the determining causes of their production and evolution would be to admit that although living in nature and society, he does not submit to the influence of the surrounding reality. Such a supposition cannot arise even in the brain of the most extreme idealist, for he would not dare to assume that we should meet the same sentiment of modesty in the respectable mother of the household and the unfortunate earning her living with her sex; the same swiftness of cal-

* The same phenomenon is observed in the insects which have succeeded in creating for themselves a social environment: the queen bee, who is the mother of the hive, does not concern herself with her progeny, and kills her daughters provided with sexual organs, whom the neutral workers are obliged to protect from her maternal fury. Certain breeds of domestic fowls have lost the instinct of maternity; although excellent layers, they never sit.

culation in the bank clerk and the philosopher; the same agility of the fingers of the professional pianist and the ditch digger. It is thus undeniable that man on the physical, intellectual, and moral sides is subject unconsciously, but profoundly, to the action of the environment in which he moves.

IV.

The Natural Environment and the Artificial or Social Environment.

The action of the environment is not merely direct, it is exercised not merely upon the organ which functions, upon the hand in the case of the pianist and the ditch digger, upon the moral sense in that of the honest woman and prostitute; it is again indirect and reacts upon all the organs. This generalisation of the action of the environment which Geoffroy Saint-Hillaire designated under the characteristic name of *subordination of the organs* and which modern naturalists call *Law of correlation*, Cuvier explains thus: "Every organised being forms a whole, a unique and closed system, whose parts correspond to each other and contribute to the same definite action by a reciprocal action. None of these parts can change without the other parts also changing." For example, the form of the teeth of an animal cannot be modified from any cause whatever without involving modifications in the jaws, the muscles which move them, the bones of the skull to which they are attached, the brain which the skull encases, the bones and muscles which support the head, the form and length of the intestines, indeed in all parts of the body. The modifications which are produced in the fore limbs as soon as they have ceased to serve for walking have led to organic transformations which have definitely separated man from the anthropoid apes.

It is not always possible to foresee and understand the modifications involved by the change which has occurred in any certain organ: for example, why the breaking of a leg or the removal of a testicle in the stag family causes the atrophy of the horn on the opposite side; why white cats are deaf; why mammals with hoofs are herbivorous and those with five toes armed with claws are carnivorous.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Chas. H. Kerr.)

(To be Continued.)

Don't forget that our £1,000 Fund is still in existence and that the sooner we get the money the sooner you get Socialism. Do your bit and do it now—and again next month.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

BRANCHES AND COMMUNICATIONS.

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Mar-
low-st., Letchmore Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch
meets Mondays, 8.30, at 15 Great-st., York-rd.
BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec.,
774 Mordock-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham. Branch
meets Sat. at Coffee House, Spicel-st.
CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the
E.C. Com. See Applications to General Secy.
EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs,
Sec., 78 Essex-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first
and last Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.
EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142
Balfour-rd., Edmonton, N.18.
HACKNEY.—Communications to the Secy., 78 Green-
wood-st., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the
Sion-rd. School, opposite Hackney Downs Sta.
ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at
144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communica-
tions to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.
MANCHESTER.—Communications to Secy., 70 New-
castle-st., Hulme, Manchester.
N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Ex-
mouth-St. School (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W.
Communications to W. F. Ticker, 51 High-rd.,
Willenden-green, N.W.10.
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy., 1
Bent, 1 Wellington-avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea.
TOOTING.—Communications to Secy., 207 Derinton-
rd., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets Fridays at 143
Beauchcroft-rd., Upper Tooting at 8 p.m.
TOTTENHAM.—Secy., C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S.
Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at
Earlsmoad School, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Dis-
cussion after branch business Public invited.
WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 51
Grosvenor-rd., Walthamstow. Branch meets at
Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday. Visitors
invited.
WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-
avenue, Watford.
WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at
167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to
P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford E.
WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at
Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS LONDON DISTRICT.

Sundays:
Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7 p.m.
Mondays:
Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.
Wednesdays:
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.
Thursdays:
Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.
Fridays:
Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.
Saturdays:
Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 105 High St.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

OBJECT.

The establishment of a system of
society based upon the common own-
ership and democratic control of the
means and instruments for producing
and distributing wealth by and in the
interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon
the ownership of the means of living (i.e. land, factories,
railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the
consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose
labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism
of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle,
between those who possess but do not produce and
those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the
emancipation of the working class from the domination
of the master class, by the conversion into the common
property of society of the means of production and
distribution, and their democratic control by the
whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working
class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the
emancipation of the working class will involve the
emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of
race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the
working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the
armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the
monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken
from the workers, the working class must organise
consciously and politically for the conquest of the
powers of government, national and local, in order
that this machinery, including these forces, may be
converted from an instrument of oppression into the
agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege,
aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of
class interests, and as the interest of the working class
is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections
of the master class, the party seeking working-class
emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore,
enters the field of political action determined to wage
war against all other political parties, whether
alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon
the members of the working class of this country to
muster under its banner to the end that a speedy ter-
mination may be wrought to the system which deprives
them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty
may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and
slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desir-
ing enrolment in the Party should apply for membership
form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 191. Vol. 16.]

LONDON, JULY, 1920.

[MONTHLY, TWO PENCE

PARADOX OR ILLUSION?

OLD GHOSTS IN NEW PAJYMAS.

An article by Christopher Sandiway which appeared in "Reynolds's Newspaper" of June 6th, while written in the fullest sympathy with the workers, presents in a new form errors that were exposed many years ago by Fair Marx in his famous work, "Value, but Price and Profit." If those who False wish to help the workers towards their emancipation would only study this work, they would not be in danger of perpetrating the illusions so ably exposed there.

Mr. Sandiway tells an imaginary friend, who is, presumably, a so-called brain-worker, that when his wages go up the value of the hand-workers' wages goes down.

Now this is obviously untrue, for if one section of the workers obtains a rise of wages the increase has to be paid by the capitalists, who cannot reduce the wages of the other sections, or raise prices because of that increase. They must therefore pocket the loss.

Mr. Sandiway is not aware of this fact, so he goes on to elaborate the idea. He says:

"Let the entire population be represented by ten men, the product of whose labour is owned and controlled by the landlord and employing class. After the latter have taken all the produce they require, the remainder we will imagine, is placed in a store and will just supply the men's material necessities. The allowance is a fixed quantity, or may vary in a slight degree at the will of the controllers."

This illustration by no means Not represents what happens. In the so days of Pharaoh goods may have Simple been stored and rationed in the manner suggested, but even then the total quantity had to vary according to the number of slaves to be fed and could not, therefore, be fixed. The capitalist method of production does not rest on chattel slavery; its

method is wage slavery. Under the first the worker was the property of his master and was completely under his control. But the wage slave is free to bargain over his conditions because he is the sole owner of his labour-power. It is true that he The bargains at a disadvantage, but the True fact that, he does bargain and can, Facts. if he prefers to starve or beg, refuse to sell his labour-power places him in a different position from the chattel slave. The share he obtains of the wealth produced is no longer dependent upon the will of the capitalist and the latter does not take what he requires but what he can.

Continuing, Mr. Sandiway says: "Supposing the wages of the men to be equal at first, each is entitled to 1-10th of the contents of the store. But one man who goes to work in a silk hat and frock coat, demands an increase to keep up appearances. If therefore his wages are doubled the contents of the store must now be divided into eleven parts, for one man counts as two. This man's share is thus 2-11ths, and the remaining nine get 1-11th each, prices have thus gone up for all, since the quantity for the same money is less."

As Mr. Sandiway has failed to show that in capitalist society the total share of the workers is fixed, but only imagines it, his figures are purely imaginary and the ten workers, instead of continuing to receive the 10-10ths among them, now receive 11-10ths.

What The real value of the wages of it the nine men has not changed: Leads To. the tenth man has doubled his income, and the fact that he can buy double the quantity of goods that each of the others can buy does not make their position any the worse.

To see where his suppositions finally lead

him we must follow Mr. Sandiway further.

First he supposes that another man of the ten obtains a 100 per cent. rise in wages, which, on his previous manner of reckoning (he cannot even take the trouble to get his own arithmetic right, and when his "silk hat" doubles his 1-10th he has, not 2-10ths but 2-11ths!) leaves the remaining eight with 1-12th each. Then he says "The remaining eight seeing prices rising, and being manual workers, 'down tools,' and as it is a question of mere paper without real material loss to himself, the controller agrees to double their wages. The contents of the store must now be divided into twenty parts to correspond with the money out-flow, each man getting 2-20ths, or 1-10th, and things are as they began."

There is one question that Mr. Sandiway might have asked himself. If the capitalists can by the issue of more paper money, or by raising prices at their own sweet will, cancel a rise of wages, why do they resist the demands of the workers at all? Why do they not adopt one or both of these expedients and save the disorganisation of business caused by strikes, of which they complain so bitterly? He is 'cute enough to see that increased production might not, of itself, bring down prices. He says: "Extra production may merely take the form of luxuries for the well-to-do. It may even be willfully destroyed to keep up prices, or cornered for the same purpose."

But if any of these expedients are necessary to the capitalists in order to prevent prices from falling, Mr. Sandiway's previous speculations fall to the ground. Capitalists destroy wealth by agreement when supply overtakes demand, thus showing that they are quite incapable of exercising collective control over the production of wealth. They only find out that supply is overtaking demand when prices fall. That they have to adopt such panic measures as destroying wealth shows how completely they are market ridden with regard to prices.

Among his other illusions Mr. Sandiway imagines that high prices can only be explained by the dwindling value of money. He calls it "the great bradbury illusion" and he thinks that he has explained what happens in his illustration where "2-20ths being found equal to 1-10th, things are as they began." Of course he has really explained nothing.

If two bradburies will only buy the same amount of commodities that one did previously one of three things must have happened. Either the prices of commodities have gone up while the value of the gold represented by the bradbury remained the same, or the value of the gold has fallen, necessitating more of it to express the same value in commodities, or the

value of the gold and the prices of commodities have both risen, but prices in far higher degree. If Mr. Sandiway thinks that the pound note does not represent one pound in gold, he must explain why it is that pound notes can be exchanged for gold at the Bank of England on demand.

As neither he nor any of the inflated currency cranks have yet succeeded in explaining this point, nor have attempted to show that the value of gold has fallen, they have failed to prove a paradox, and we are justified in presuming that things are what they seem—that prices have actually risen and not that paper juggling makes it merely appear so.

There are two factors that may cause prices to rise: first, an increase in the labour-time required to produce commodities; secondly, the demand being greater than the supply. Under the first heading an increase in the labour time required to produce commodities, and under the second an extension of markets, which would increase demand, or the elimination of competition through the industrial paralysis of large wealth-producing areas.

With regard to the main stream of commodities that provides for the maintenance of society, it is an indisputable fact that the labour-time required for their production, instead of increasing, diminishes. Modern machinery and methods, constantly improving, are continually reducing the labour-time required for production. It is obvious, too, that no new markets have been discovered. If there had been, the necessity for a world war to decide who should dominate existing markets would not have arisen. There remains, then, only one explanation of high prices—the elimination of competition through the commercial paralysis of large industrial areas. The countries that have been worsted in the world war are failing to compete, thus leaving a shortage of commodities to be made up by the victors, the irony of the situation being that the wage-slaves who fought and created these possibilities for their masters, have to submit to the higher prices, the capitalists strenuously resisting, all the while, every effort of their one-time "heroes" to raise wages.

All the cheap clap-trap about the "vicious circle" of wages rising, then prices, to be repeated again and again, is mere bluff, the object of which is to restrain the workers from asking for more. High wages are not the cause of high prices. Prices are high because demand is greater than supply, and the workers are compelled to struggle for higher wages in order to maintain their standard of living. When prices fall it will be because the markets cannot absorb all the goods produced, then unemployed

ment will be greater and wages will fall. Thus wages are seldom for any length of time above the bare cost of living on the average, and such periods are about balanced by the periods when they are below. And it becomes increasingly difficult for the workers to force up wages, even on a rising market, because during the most prosperous times the supply of labour-power is always greater than the demand.

If Mr. Sandiway, therefore, examines the capitalist method of production in itself instead of looking at the results and imagining the process, he will find that the capitalists do not take from the wealth produced by the workers "all the produce they require." Instead, they take all the wealth produced, and after realising by its sale the surplus value contained in it—the value added to the material over and above the wages paid to those who add that value (i.e., the workers)—use the proceeds partly to satisfy their personal needs and partly to extend the process of exploitation. The difference between the actual result and Mr. Sandiway's being that the capitalists reduce the quantity of labour-power they purchase when the demand for commodities slackens, and, consequently, reduce the amount of produce that goes to the workers. The workers' share is not fixed, but varies according to the capacity of the markets to absorb the products of their labour.

If Mr. Sandiway were to examine the figures relating to the number of workers engaged in productive work and the large number serving the capitalists' personal interests. He might then realise how small a portion of the total wealth produced goes to the actual producers. He would also realise that prices would go up whether the workers asked for more wages or not, if the markets were favourable. He would also find that wages bear no relation to prices. Being the price of labour power, they can rise and fall quite independently of prices, and that without affecting them, as there is so wide a margin between the total wealth produced and the total wages paid.

If his sympathies are with the workers, therefore, Mr. Sandiway should study these facts instead of telling them that when "the brainworkers get a rise in wages it is at the expense of the handworkers" and vice versa. He should then tell them that the real antagonism is between the working class as a whole and the capitalist class, that while they are forced to struggle for higher wages when prices rise, their wages fall when the demand for labour-power slackens, thus keeping them always on the poverty line.

F. F.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF SOCIALIST THEORY.

(Continued.)

In previous articles under the above heading we have obtained a glimpse of the Materialist Conception of History. Bound up with this theory is the next one which we propose investigating, namely, the theory of the Class Struggle.

According to this theory history is made up of the struggles of different classes in society for social supremacy; and the origin of the different classes is to be sought in the prevailing method of wealth production and distribution at the different periods.

The scientific method of enquiry is in the first place to separate phenomena into different categories, grouping together things that have the same characteristics. For instance, in the animal world all warm-blooded, feathered animals with two limbs in the form of wings are classified as birds; all cold-blooded, vertebrate, gill-breathing animals living in water and with limbs in the form of fins, are classified as fishes. These are two biological classes. Clearness in distinguishing is a pre-requisite of clear thinking. If things are correctly classified a good deal of the essential work of investigation is already accomplished.

When we apply the method of classification to human society we must separate the members of society into social classes according to their general characteristics.

Now the essential business of society is the material needs of the human beings that compose it—the provision of food, clothing, shelter, and so on. In order to satisfy these human needs the production of wealth must be carried on. Therefore in classifying the members of society they must be put into groups according to the position they occupy in relation to the production of wealth.

Different periods in social evolution are clearly marked off from each other by the different methods of producing the social wealth. Thus ancient Rome was characterised by its chattel slavery, as it was by means of the chattel slave that the bulk of the Roman wealth of that time was produced. The Middle Ages was characterised by its bond slavery, as the bulk of the wealth of the Middle Ages was produced by the bond slave.

Within the society of Roman times and of the Middle Ages there were other classes alongside the chattel slaves and the bond slaves. The relations and interests, created by wealth production based upon the two methods mentioned,

split society up into various parts corresponding to the parts played in the production of the wealth of those times.

This is the key to the situation. Once obtain a knowledge of the way the members of a given society at a given period obtain their livelihoods and a clear understanding is gained of that society, its social classes, its development, and its eventual break-up.

Let us now examine present-day society in the manner set forth.

To begin with, we must classify—find out what are the classes that compose society, and in order to do this we must see how the various members of society obtain their livelihood.

If we examine the method of living of all the people we see around us and with whom we come into contact at different times during the course of our lives, we find that they all fall under one or the other of two headings (leaving beggars out of the question)—those who have to work for their living, and those who have their living provided for them by those who work.

Clothes are made, houses are built, railways and ships are constructed, by obtaining from nature the material, then changing its place, its form, its character, and so giving it those qualities and properties necessary to satisfy our requirements. Nature provides the material, but its place and form are changed by the application of human energy—in other words, by the people working. There is no other way of producing wealth than by working. This is too obvious to need labouring further.

Who, then, does the working that produces the wealth of to-day? Obviously those whom everyone is agreed in calling the working class—the class of people that works. If we go into a factory, mill, mine, or office we see people performing various functions in the work of turning out wealth. Some are tending machines, some hauling ropes, some pushing pens; some are foremen, some overseers—but all of them are workers. All have to be at their various functions at given times and all have to perform their allotted tasks. None dare cease work without risk of losing his occupation and consequently his means of livelihood, whether he wears a collar or a "kercher" about his neck, sports corduroys or "morning" clothes, smokes woodbines or cigars. In short, they are all employees of that mysterious entity, "the firm."

Now what is "the firm"? It is not composed of the factory workers as they are employees; nor is it composed of the office staff as they are employees; likewise the foremen and managers are employees.

The mysterious thing called "the firm"

represents people outside the sphere of work altogether, i.e., the people who regularly draw their dividends out of the company, but who are seldom or never seen anywhere near the field of productive operations. The dividend-drawers are scattered all over the earth—here to-day and hundreds of miles away to-morrow.

The mass of the population are those who live by working—who are dependent for their livelihood upon finding employment for their mental or physical energies. In other words they belong to the employed or working class.

A very small proportion of the population (becoming relatively smaller every day) belong to the dividend-drawing, employing, or capitalist class. In spite of the fact that they idle their lives away, wealth pours regularly into their coffers in ever-increasing quantities.

The question now arises: How is one section of the community enabled to occupy the position of employing class whilst the other section has to occupy the position of employed?

The answer is not far to seek. The members of the employed class are bound to find employment because they do not own either the means of production or the wealth produced. The only possession they have is the capability to perform mental or physical work (the two are, of course, not distinct, although it is customary to distinguish them in this way).

Consequently, in order to obtain the means to sustain life, they must work for the owners of the means of production, in spite of the fact that they themselves have produced those same means of production, with the exception of what nature provides.

The employing or capitalist class own the means of producing and distributing the wealth of our times (the extent of the mighty amalgamations that have been portrayed in the papers recently should drive this point home to the most apathetic worker). They can at will (and do during lockouts) deny the workers access to the instruments of production, so that production may be at times suspended (as during so-called over-production) even though myriads of people may be perishing from lack of food clothing, and shelter.

In order that the machinery of present-day production can be set in motion it is necessary that capital shall be invested in certain ways. The employing class supply the capital with which to commence a process of producing wealth. This fact leads many astray, and has given birth to the idea that "we cannot do without the capitalist." This method of setting the productive machinery in motion, however, is peculiar to the capitalist method of production. In pre-capitalist days other methods operated, and in post-capitalist days different

methods will also obtain. In the last analysis, however, the workers produce the very capital that oils the machinery of production. We shall return to this point later.

The capitalists, then, have possession of the wealth of capitalist society (we leave aside for the moment the question of how they obtained or retain possession), and the workers are therefore compelled to sell their power to work under the conditions laid down by the class that own the means whereby the workers live. In return for the duties the workers discharge they are paid at certain rates of wages. The workers do not work because they are fond of work; they work to obtain wages (or salaries) because wages represent to them the means of obtaining to some extent the necessities to sustain life.

It will therefore be seen that the modern worker is a slave, a wage-slave, and his slavery is every bit as acute as the slavery of the chattel slave or the bondsman of the past, though the leather thong is replaced by the lash of starvation. The sight of dependent loved ones starving has proved a more potent lash than any instrument invented by man.

From the foregoing it will be seen that modern society is composed of two distinct social classes—the capitalist class and the working class. A very cursory examination will show that the interests of the two classes, i.e., their class interests, are, and must be, quite distinct and in direct opposition. A line of action that harmonises with the interests of the one class is directly antagonistic to the interests of the other.

To the capitalist the employment of workers signifies the giving up, in the form of wages, of a certain portion of the wealth he possesses. His aim, therefore, is to reduce this portion to the absolute minimum—to pay as little wages as possible. This object he endeavours to accomplish by the introduction of improved machinery—*labour-saving* devices—improved methods, and speeding up the employed. The ideal he aims at is the time foreshadowed by Aristotle, when the tool could by itself execute its function—the capitalist could then enjoy all the wealth produced and would have no need to relinquish a part of it to pay troublesome wage-earners!

The worker, on the other hand, who is compelled to sell his energies in one way or another in order to buy the necessities of life, aims at getting as high a wage as possible and resisting the introduction of new methods, etc., as the latter tends to take away from him his means of obtaining a livelihood. He aims at the ideal of the ceaseless multiplication of jobs.

Herein, then, is apparent the antagonism of

interests within present society. This antagonism of interests has bred the modern class struggle—the struggle of the working class against the master class—that has been fought out for years in a vague and half unconscious manner by combinations of workers during the industrial conflicts that yearly attain greater proportions. Ultimately this struggle, like all preceding class struggles, must be fought out on the political field as it is at the bottom a struggle for supremacy; the only solution to the conflict and to the contradictions that exist to-day is the overthrow of the present ruling class, the capitalists. GILMAC.

(To be Continued.)

A SOCIALIST VIEW OF BOLSHEVIST POLICY.

Where We Stand.

Ever since the Bolshevik minority seized the control of affairs in Russia we have been told that their "success" had completely changed Socialist policy. These "Communists" declare that the policy of Marx and Engels is out of date. Lenin and Trotsky are worshipped as the pathfinders of a shorter and easier road to Communism.

Unfortunately for these "Bolsheviks," no evidence has yet been supplied to show wherein the policy of Marx and Engels is no longer useful, and until that evidence comes the Socialist Party of Great Britain will continue to advocate the same Marxian policy as before. We will continue to expose and oppose the present system and all its defenders and apologists. We shall insist upon the necessity of the working class understanding Socialism and organising within a political party to obtain it.

Socialism Far Off in Russia.

When we are told that Socialism has been obtained in Russia without the long, hard and tedious work of educating the mass of workers in Socialism we not only deny it but refer our critics to Lenin's own confessions. His statements prove that even though a vigorous and small minority may be able to seize power for a time, they can only hold it by modifying their plans to suit the ignorant majority. The minority in power in an economically backward country are forced to adapt their program to the undeveloped conditions and make continual concessions to the capitalist world around them. Offers to pay war debts to the Allies, to establish a Constituent Assembly, to compensate capitalists for losses, to cease propaganda in other countries, and to grant exploitation rights

throughout Russia to the Western capitalists all show how far along the capitalist road they have had to travel and how badly they need the economic help of other countries. It shows above all that their loud and defiant challenge to the capitalist world has been silenced by their own internal and external weaknesses as we have so often predicted in these pages.

Lenin's Confessions.

The folly of adopting Bolshevik methods here is admitted by Lenin in his pamphlet "The Chief Tasks of Our Times" (p. 10). "A backward country can revolt quicker, because its opponent is rotten to the core, its middle class is not organised; but in order to continue the revolution a backward country will require immediately more circumspection, prudence, and endurance. In Western Europe it will be quite different; there it is much more difficult to begin, but it will be much easier to go on. This cannot be otherwise because there the proletariat is better organised and more closely united."

Those who say "Russia can fight the world" are answered by Lenin:

"Only a madman can imagine that the task of dethroning International Imperialism can be fulfilled by Russia alone."

Lenin admits that "France and England have been learning for centuries what we have only learnt since 1905. Every class-conscious worker knows that the revolution grows but slowly amongst the free institutions of a united bourgeoisie, and that we shall only be able to fight against such forces when we are able to do so in conjunction with the revolutionary proletariat of Germany, France, and England. Till then, sad and contrary to revolutionary traditions as it may be, our only possible policy is to wait, to tuck, and to retreat."

State Capitalism for Russia.

We have often stated that because of a large anti-Socialist peasantry and vast untrained population, Russia was a long way from Socialism. Lenin has now to admit this by saying: "Reality says that State Capitalism would be a step forward for us; if we were able to bring about State Capitalism in a short time it would be a victory for us. How could they be so blind as not to see that our enemy is the small capitalist, the small owner? How could they see the chief enemy in State Capitalism? In the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism our chief enemy is the small bourgeoisie, with its economic customs, habits and position" (p. 11).

This reply of Lenin to the Communists of the Left (Bucharin and others) contains the further

statement that, "To bring about State Capitalism at the present time means to establish the control and order formerly achieved by the propertied classes. We have in Germany an example of State Capitalism, and we know she proved our superior. If you would only give a little thought to what the security of such State Socialism would mean in Russia, a Soviet Russia, you would recognise that only madmen whose heads are full of formulas and doctrines can deny that State Socialism is our salvation. If we possessed it in Russia the transition to complete Socialism would be easy, because State Socialism is centralisation control, socialisation—in fact, everything that we lack. The greatest menace to us is the small bourgeoisie, which, owing to the history and economics of Russia, is the best organised class, and which prevents us from taking the step, on which depends the success of Socialism."

Here we have plain admissions of the unripeness of the great mass of Russian people for Socialism and the small scale of Russian production.

If we are to copy Bolshevik policy in other countries we should have to demand State Capitalism, which is not a step to Socialism in advanced capitalist countries. The fact remains, as Lenin is driven to confess, that we do not have to learn from Russia, but Russia has to learn from lands where large scale production is dominant.

Lenin and the Trusts.

"My statement that in order to properly understand one's task one should learn Socialism from the promoters of Trusts aroused the indignation of the Communists of the Left. Yes, we do not want to teach the Trusts; on the contrary, we want to learn from them." (Page 12.) Thus Lenin speaks to his critics. Owing to the untrained character of the workers and their failure to grasp the necessity of discipline and order in large scale production, Lenin has to employ "capitalist" experts to run the factories. He tells us: "We know all about Socialism, but we do not know how to organise on a large scale, how to manage distribution, and so on. The old Bolshevik leaders have not taught us these things, and this is not to the credit of our party. We have yet to go through this course, and we say: Even if a man is a scoundrel of the deepest dye, if he is a merchant, experienced in organising production and distribution on a large scale, we must learn from him; if we do not learn from these people, we shall never achieve Socialism, and the revolution will never get beyond the present stage. Socialism can only be reached by the development of State Capitalism the careful organisation of finance, control and

discipline among the workers. Without this there is no Socialism." (P. 12.)

That Socialism can only be reached through State Capitalism is untrue. Socialism depends upon large-scale production, whether organised by Trusts or Governments. State capitalism may be the method used in Russia, but only because the Bolshevik Government find their theories of doing without capitalist development unworkable—hence they are forced to retreat along the capitalist road.

The Internal Conflict.

Lenin goes on: "The workers who base their activities on the principles of State Socialism are the most successful. It is so in the tanning, textile, and sugar industries, where the workers, knowing their industry, and wishing to preserve and to develop it, recognise with proletarian common sense that they are unable at present to cope with such a task, and therefore allot one third of the places to the capitalists in order to learn from them."

This concession is another example of the conflict between Bolshevik theory and practice, for the very argument of Lenin against Kautsky and others was that in Russia they could go right ahead without needing the capitalist development such as it exists in other countries.

The whole speech of Lenin is directed against the growing body of workers in Russia who took Lenin at his word. These people fondly imagined that after throwing over Kerenky they could usher in freedom and ignore the capitalist world around them. They thought that factory discipline, Socialist education, and intelligent skilled supervision were simply pedantic ideas.

A further quotation from Lenin will make this clear "Naturally the difficulties of organisation are enormous, but I do not see the least reason for despair and despondency in the fact that the Russian Revolution, having first solved the easier task—the overthrow of the landowners and the bourgeoisie, is now faced with the more difficult Socialist task of organising national finance and control, a task which is the initial stage of Socialism, and is inevitable, as is fully understood by the majority of class-conscious workers."

He also says: "It is time to remonstrate when some people have worked themselves up to a state in which they consider the introduction of discipline into the ranks of the workers as a step backwards." And he points out that "by the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and landowners we have cleared the way, we have not erected the structure of Socialism."

How far they have cleared the capitalists out of the way is uncertain, as they are a long way

from self-reliance. The long road ahead is admitted by Lenin in these words: "Until the workers have learned to organise on a large scale they are not Socialists, nor builders of a Socialist structure of society, and will not acquire the necessary knowledge for the establishment of the new world order. The path of organisation is a long one, and the tasks of Socialist constructive work require strenuous and continuous effort, with a corresponding knowledge which we do not sufficiently possess. It is hardly to be expected that the even more developed following generation will accomplish a complete transition into Socialism." (P. 13.)

The Rule of the Minority.

The denunciation of democracy by the Bolshevik leaders is quite understandable if we realise that only the minority in Russia are Communists. Lenin therefore denies control of affairs to the majority, but he cannot escape from the compromise involved in ruling with a minority. Not only is control of Russian affairs out of the hands of the Soviets as a whole, but not even all the members of the Communist Party are allowed to vote. Linoviev, a leading Commissar, in his report to the First Congress of the Third International said:

"Our Central Committee has decided to deprive certain categories of party members of the right to vote at the Congress of the party. Certainly it is unheard of to limit the right of voting within the party, but the entire party has approved this measure, which is to assure the homogenous unity of the Communists. So that in fact, we have 500,000 members who manage the entire State machine from top to bottom." ("The Socialist," 29.4.20. Italics not ours.)

So half a million members of the Communist Party (counting even those who are refused a vote within the party) control a society of 180 million members. It is quite plain why other parties' papers were suppressed: obviously they could influence the great majority outside the Communist Party. The maintenance of power was assured by the Bolshevik minority through its control of political power and the armed forces.

A. K.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions for the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free ...	2s. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " " " " " "	1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

THURSDAY, JULY 1, 1920.



AMRITSAR AGAIN.

We were, due to the systematic terrorism our democratic rulers have succeeded in establishing, prevented from commenting upon the report of the Commission concerning the Punjab disturbances at the time the report was published. The matter has again cropped up, in the House of Commons, and Mr. Montague, the Secretary of State for India, made what was described as a terrible speech. From it we reproduce the following passage because of the implications contained in it.

"I say, further, that when you pass an order that all Indians, whoever they may be, must forcibly or voluntarily salaam any officer of His Majesty the King, you are enforcing racial humiliation. I say, thirdly, that when you take selected schoolboys from a school, guilty or innocent, and whip them publicly, when you put up a triangle, where an outrage which we all deplore, and which all India deplores, has taken place, and whip people who have not been convicted, when you flog a wedding party, you are indulging in frightfulness."

We are not going to add anything to those words: their import will make itself felt.

While we are upon this matter notice may be taken that the Labour Party were dumb during the debate. Only Clynes got up and passed a few inane remarks about the soldier's difficulties and the course the Party were going to follow. As for the crime against the working class of India, they left it severely alone.

The most pungent criticism, as possibly the most hypocritical, was supplied by Mr. Asquith.

and surely the spectacle of the hero of Featherstone upbraiding the hero of Amritsar was meant to supply the element of comedy to the piece.

THE PEACEMAKERS.

A week or two ago the Poles appeared to be making progress against the Bolshevik armies, and our masters and pastors, buoyed up with false hopes, declared that it would not be right for them to try to secure peace in the midst of the Poles' success. The usual has happened, and at once the air is thick with threats of what the Bolsheviks will find up against them if they do not make peace immediately. Isn't it a huge joke?

THE RUSSIAN DICTATORSHIP.

In 1918 a sharp controversy took place between Karl Kautsky, of the German Social Democratic Party, and Nikolai Lenin, of the Russian Bolsheviks, on the question of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. The debate has lately been translated into English, Kautsky's contribution by the I.L.P., under the title "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat" and Lenin's by the B.S.P., under the title "The Proletarian Revolution."

Lenin's pamphlet is the more lively the more abusive, and, on a superficial reading, the more effective statement. One capitalist critic has been so carried away by the stream of denunciation that runs from one end to the other of the pamphlet that he declared that Lenin had practically pulverised Kautsky.

But denunciation, however justified, is not argument, and when the case is more closely examined one gains the impression that a good deal of the abuse is used to hide the lack of argument, that in some cases is painfully apparent.

How valueless is Lenin's judgment of Kautsky is shown by one outstanding fact. In Lenin's view Kautsky was a Marxist until the war broke out in 1914, when he became a "renegade." Yet as every Socialist knows, apart from previous actions in Germany, 14 years before the war Kautsky had proclaimed his renunciation of Marxism when he drafted the well-known "Kautsky resolution" at the 1930 International Socialist Congress. That resolution stated that a Socialist could accept a gift of a seat in a capitalist cabinet in a national emergency, such as war. His support of the German capitalist class in the war was therefore only the logical outcome of his resolution in 1900.

Kautsky says the question is one of the "clashing of two fundamentally distinct methods, that of democracy and dictatorship." (P. 1.) Lenin retorts by claiming that the question is one "of the relation between the proletarian State and the bourgeois State, between proletarian democracy and bourgeois democracy." (P. 10.)

It is obvious that Lenin's statement is a shuffle. For relations to exist between a proletarian State and a bourgeois State both these States must exist at the same moment. Are these two States existing in Russia to-day? If not there can be no question of such a relation there.

Again, what is "Democracy?" Kautsky says "Democracy signifies the rule of the majority, but not less the protection of minorities." (P. 30.) Lenin pours scorn upon the latter part of this definition, and refers to the repression of strikers, internationalists, and others in democratic countries like America, Switzerland, and England. True as this retort is against the "protection of minorities," it does not touch the question of what is democracy, and Lenin carefully evades any definition himself. His use of the terms "proletarian" and "bourgeois" democracy merely clouds the issue.

Democracy means "Rule by majority," and the trimmings introduced by both Lenin and Kautsky are quite secondary to this main point. It is generally taken that the minority shall be allowed to express their views and may endeavour to convert the majority to their ideas, while accepting for the time being the majority decisions. This, however, depends upon circumstances and conditions, such as war, where this allowance would not be made. Kautsky himself supported the German Government in repressing minorities in Germany.

His grief at the capitalists being deprived of the vote under the Bolsheviks, receives an answer from Lenin that will hardly please the supporters of the latter here, who have proclaimed it as a necessary factor in working-class policy. He says: "One may say in this connection that the question about the suppression of the franchise of the exploiter is *entirely a Russian question* and not at all one of the dictatorship of the proletariat in general." (P. 38. Italics in original.)

As a matter of fact, it is a question of the conditions existing at the time. If the capitalists were endeavouring to foment civil war—as they were doing at that time—they would be outlawed and thus deprived of most civil privileges.

But what is "bourgeois" democracy? Lenin points to modern capitalist countries as examples.

Yet in all these countries the proletariat not only form the majority of the population, but also have the majority of the votes.

So a "bourgeois" democracy is one where the proletariat are in a majority. Then what is a "proletarian" democracy? We are told that it is "a democracy for the poor," (p. 31. Italics Lenin's) while in a bourgeois democracy, even the best, "We are ruled, and our State is run by bourgeois bureaucrats, by capitalist parliaments, by capitalist judges." (Ibid.)

But if democracy is the rule of the majority, and in the capitalist countries mentioned the proletariat form the majority of the population and have the majority of the votes, it is clear that the proletariat must have voted the capitalists into Parliament and power. Why did they not vote themselves into power? Lenin's statement on this point is such a stupid lie as to cause wonder that a man of his abilities should have written so glaring a contradiction of the facts. He says: "The labouring masses are kept away from bourgeois parliament (which *never* decides the most important questions in a bourgeois democracy as they are decided by the Stock Exchange and the banks) by a thousand and one barriers." (P. 29.)

Lenin does not give one, let alone a thousand and one, of these barriers, for the simple reason that they are non-existent outside his imagination.

This is one of the points on which Kautsky scores heavily and Lenin is reduced to evasion.

On page 12 of his pamphlet Kautsky says: "Every conscious human action presupposes a will. The will to Socialism is the first condition for its accomplishment."

"This Will is created by the great industry. . . . Small production always creates the Will to uphold or to obtain private property in the means of production which are in vogue, not the Will to social property, to Socialism."

That is the situation. While the workers agree with capitalism, they will vote capitalists into Parliament. When they agree with Socialism—or "Will to Socialism"—they will send Socialists there.

And—how short is Lenin's memory!—both he and his colleagues were voted into a "bourgeois" Parliament by the "labouring masses."

Lenin on p. 30 of his book says: "the Soviet regime is a million times more democratic than the most democratic regime in a bourgeois republic."

What is the Soviet Regime?

The word "Soviet" is used by many supporters of the Bolsheviks as though it denoted some newly discovered magical power. When one is told that it merely means "Council" the magic vanishes;

At the base of this system are the Urban and Rural Councils, directly elected by the sections qualified to vote. The delegates are elected in the proportion of one delegate to every 1,000 members in the towns (up to a maximum of 1,000 councillors), and one delegate to every 100 inhabitants in the country.

Above this comes the Volost Congress. A Volost is a group of villages, and the Congress is composed of delegates from the Councils of these village groups.

Next above in the order is the District Congress composed of representatives from the Village Councils.

Still higher is the County Congress consisting of representatives from the Urban Councils and the Volost Congresses.

Overriding all these bodies is the Regional Congress made up of delegates from the Urban Councils and Congresses of the Country Districts.

At the apex of the system is the All Russia Congress of Councils which is the supreme authority of the Russian Republic. This is formed of delegates from the Urban Councils and the Congresses of County Councils.

We have, then, six grades of authority in the Russian system. But note how they are elected.

The "labouring masses" vote once—namely, at the local councils, urban and village. This is their one and only vote. All the other grades are elected by the delegates of the Congress immediately below it.

Thus the Volost Congress is elected by the Village Group Councils; the District Congress by the general Village Councils; the County Congress by the Urban Councils and Volost Congresses; the Regional Congress by the Urban Councils and Congresses of Country Districts; and the All Russia Congress by Urban Councils and Congresses of County Councils.

We see, then, that "the supreme authority of the Russian Council Republic" is removed five stages beyond the vote, reach, or control of the workers.

Another interesting point is the ratio between the urban and country representatives. Thus for the All Russia Congress of Councils the Urban Councils send one representative for every 25,000, while the County Council Congresses send one delegate for every 125,000, or to put it another way, the Urban Councils have five times the representation of the County Councils. The same ratio applies to Regional and County Congresses. These figures have a peculiar significance.

The Bolsheviks, naturally, find their chief support in the urban centres. By this basis of

representation they are able to ensure the practical certainty of a majority in "the supreme authority of the Russian Republic." "And that's how it's done," as the stage conjuror says.

This method may be suitable to Russian conditions, but to claim for such a system that it is "a million times more democratic than the most democratic regime in a bourgeois republic"—where the workers have a direct, and overwhelming, vote for the very centre of power—is the wildest nonsense.

But what of the Recall? we may be asked. Let us see what the clause says.

"The electors have at any time the right to recall the delegates whom they have sent to the Council and to proceed to new elections."

Two interpretations may be given to this clause. First—if as the words state—the recall is limited to the Councils, all the Congresses are free from this control. Secondly, if the clause is intended to apply to all the grades, then the workers can only use it for Local Councils as they are not voters in any other grade.

Marx, of course, is freely quoted by both writers. On p. 140 Kautsky, while stating that the Bolsheviks are Marxists, asks how they find a Marxist foundation for their proceedings.

"They remembered, opportunely, the expression 'the dictatorship of the proletariat' which Marx used in a letter in 1875."

Kautsky states that this is the only place in the whole of Marx's writings where the phrase occurs, though Engels used it in his preface to the 3rd edition of Marx's "Civil War in France."

Lenin's reply to this is to call the passage a "celebrated" one, and to call Kautsky several more names. He then makes the following statement:

"Kautsky cannot but know that both Marx and Engels both in their letters and public writings, spoke repeatedly about the dictatorship of the proletariat, both before and after the Commune." (P. 12. Italics in original.)

Here was a grand opportunity for Lenin to get in a powerful blow by giving some of these "letters and public writings," but, to the chagrin, no doubt, of his followers, he does not give a single case outside those mentioned above. There are endeavours to twist some of Marx's statements on the Commune of Paris (1871) into a support of this claim, but they are all dismal failures. Only in the Communist Manifesto is found a phrase—"the proletariat organised as a ruling class"—that bears any resemblance.

But a more important point remains. Every

student of Marx knows how he laid bare the laws of social evolution and claimed that, in broad outline, all nations must follow these laws in their development.

Kautsky uses this fact with great effect, and it forms the strongest argument in the whole of his pamphlet. On page 98 he gives the well-known phrase from the preface to the 1st Volume of "Capital."

"One nation can and should learn from others. And even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement—it can neither clear by bold leaps nor remove by legal enactments the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth pangs."

How does Lenin deal with this famous phrase of Marx's? By entirely ignoring it. There is not a single reference to it in the whole of his reply. More than this, the quotation given above from page 140 of Kautsky's pamphlet is printed by Lenin on pp. 11-12 of his reply. Immediately preceding the sentence quoted Kautsky says:

"The Bolsheviks are Marxists, and have inspired the proletarian sections coming under their influence with great enthusiasm for Marxism. Their dictatorship, however, is in contradiction to the Marxian teaching that no people can overcome the obstacles offered by the successive phases of their development by a jump or by legal enactment."

This ignoring of one part of a paragraph while quoting the other part is full proof Lenin deliberately avoided this important question.

Kautsky's analysis of the conditions prevailing in Russia, with the danger to the Russian Republic from American and even more from German capital, is well done, but is entirely ingored by Lenin.

This controversy, along with the events that have taken place since it occurred, adds considerable evidence of the correctness of the deduction we drew from the situation in 1918.

In the midst of the special conditions and chaos caused by the war, when the old exploiting regime had broken down and the new exploiting class were too weak to take hold of power, a small but resolute minority seized the political machinery and took control of affairs. The mass of the workers in Russia are not Socialists, neither do they understand the principles of Socialism nor desire to see Socialism established.

The new ruling minority promised peace and—to their highest credit—established it. That this peace has been broken and they have been

compelled to take up war again is due entirely to the Imperialist aims of the capitalist class of Europe. Despite this great burden and the appalling chaos in which they found Russia, they have, according to the accounts of various witnesses who have visited Russia since the Bolsheviks came into power, done wonders in the way of reconstruction and reorganisation. Their success in these matters has caused large numbers of Russians who are opponents to Socialism to give their support to the Bolsheviks as the only party in the country who can get things done.

But rule by a minority—even a Marxist minority—is not Socialism. Not until the instruments and methods of production have reached the stage of large machinery and mass organisation is it possible for social production to develop. When the workers, organised and trained in this social production, reach an understanding of their slave position, and decide to supplement social production by social ownership, through the seizure of political power, then, and not till then, will Socialism be established.

The Bolsheviks based their hopes on a rising of the proletariat of Western Europe to make their position secure. But the Western proletariat did not rise, nor do they show any signs of doing so up to the present. This failure of their basic hope leaves the Bolsheviks in conditions that make inevitable the entry into, and development of capitalism in, Russia.

The Bolsheviks may try to save as much of their system as possible, but the events will prove the correctness of Marx's views on the failure of attempts to jump the stages in social evolution. Their failure, however, will not be all disaster.

They will have shown the workers of the world that the capitalist class is a useless and parasitic class in modern society. They will have shown that men holding Socialist views and of the working class could take charge of huge affairs and manage them with great success, in the midst of the wildest chaos, and while hampered by enemies within and without. Already the lesson is beginning to be learnt, and though only affecting a few relatively at present, it is spreading with steady persistence.

When the workers awaken to an understanding of the position in which they exist, and begin to fight the class war consciously in numbers that seriously count, the rule of the Russian Bolsheviks will be a splendid lesson, not on the value of "Soviet" or "Dictatorship," but on the ability of the working class to manage its own affairs. It will have done its share in "shortening and lessening the birth pangs" of Socialism.

J. F.

THE HISTORICAL METHOD OF MARX.

REPRINTED FROM THE "INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW,"

OCT., 1907.

IV.

The Natural Environment and the Artificial or Social Environment—Continued.

A simple change in the habits, by subjecting one or more organs to an unaccustomed use, sometimes results in radical modifications in the whole organism. Darwin says that the mere fact of constantly browsing on steep slopes has occasioned variations in the skeletons of certain breeds of Scotch cows. Naturalists agree in regarding the cetacea—whales, cachalots and dolphins—as former terrestrial mammals which, finding in the sea food more abundant and easier to procure, became swimmers and divers: this new sort of life transformed their organs, reducing to a rudimentary state those no longer used, developing the others and adapting them to the needs of the aquatic environment. The plants of the Sahara Desert, to adapt themselves to the arid environment, have been obliged to dwarf themselves, to reduce the number of their leaves to two or four, to take on a layer of wax to prevent evaporation, and to prolong their roots enormously in search of moisture: their periodic changes come counter to the ordinary seasons; they are dormant in summer during the hot season and vegetate in the winter, in the season relatively cold and moist. Plants in other deserts present analogous characteristics: a given environment implies the existence of beings showing a combination of definite characteristics.

The cosmic or natural environments, to which vegetables and animals must adapt themselves under pain of death, constitute, like the organized being of which Cuvier speaks, combinations, complex systems without precise limits in space, the parts of which are: the geologic formation and composition of the soil, nearness to the equator, elevation above the sea level, courses of rivers which irrigate it, quantity of rain which it receives and the solar heat which it stores up, etc., and plants and animals which live in it. These parts correspond to each other in such a way that one of them cannot change without involving change in the other parts: the changes in the natural environment, although less rapid than those produced in organized beings, are nevertheless appreciable. The forests, for example, have an influence on the temperature and the rains, consequently on

the humidity and the physical composition of the soil. Darwin has shown that animals apparently insignificant, like the worm, have played a considerable part in the formation of vegetable mold; Berthelot and the agricultural experts Hellriegel and Willfarth have proved that the bacteria which swarm in the protuberances of the roots of the leguminosae are active in fertilising the soil. Man by tillage and cultivation exercises a marked influence over the natural environment; forest clearings begun by the Romans have transformed fertile countries in Asia and Africa into uninhabitable deserts.

Vegetables, animals and man in a state of nature, all of which are subject to the action of the natural environment, without other means of resistance than the faculty of adaptation of their organs, must end by differentiating themselves, even though they might have a common origin, if, during hundreds and thousands of generations they live in different natural environments. The unlike natural environments thus tend to diversify men as well as plants and animals. It is, in fact, during the savage period that the different human races were formed.

Man does not merely modify by his industry the environments in which he lives, but he creates out of whole cloth an artificial or social environment, which permits him, if not to remove his organism from the natural environment, at least to reduce this action considerably. But this artificial environment in its turn operates upon man as he comes to it from his natural environment. Man, like the domesticated plant and animal, thus undergoes the action of two environments.

The artificial or social environments which men have successively created differ among themselves in their degree of elaboration and complexity, but environments of the same degree of elaboration and complexity offer great resemblances among themselves, whatever may be the human races which have created them, and whatever may be their geographical habitats: so that if men continue to undergo the diversifying action of unlike natural environments, they are equally subject to the action of similar artificial environments which operate to diminish the differences of races and to develop in them the same needs, the same interests, the same passions and the same mentality. Moreover, the same natural environments, as for example, those situated at the same latitude and altitude, exercise an equal unifying action on the vegetables and animals which live in them; they have an analogous flora and fauna. Like artificial environments thus tend to unify the human species, which unlike natural environ-

ments, have diversified into races and sub-races.

The natural environment evolves with such extreme slowness that the vegetable and animal species which adapt themselves to it seem immutable. The artificial environment, on the contrary, evolves with an increasing rapidity, thus the history of man and of his societies compared with that of animals and vegetables is extraordinarily mobile.

The artificial environments, like organised being and the natural environment, form combinations, complex systems without precise limits in space and time, the parts of which correspond to each other and are so closely bound together that one alone cannot be modified without all the others being shaken and being compelled to undergo retouchings in their turn. The artificial or social environment, of an extreme simplicity and consisting of a small number of parts in savage peoples, becomes complicated in proportion as man progresses by the addition of new parts and by the development of those already existing. It has been formed since the historic period by economic, social, political and legal institutions, by traditions, customs, manners and morals, by common sense and public opinion, by religious literatures, arts, philosophies, sciences, modes of production and exchange, etc., and by the men who live in it. These parts, by transforming themselves and by reacting on each other, have given birth to a series of social environments more and more complex and extended, which, in proportion to their extension, have modified men; for, like the natural environment, a given social environment implies the existence of men presenting a certain combination of analogous characteristics, physical and moral. If all these corresponding parts were stable or varied only with excessive slowness, like those of the natural environment, the artificial environment would remain in equilibrium and there would be no history; its equilibrium, on the contrary, is extremely and increasingly unstable, constantly put out of balance by the changes working in one or another of its parts, which then reacts on all the others.

The parts of an organised being, like those of a natural environment, react upon each other directly, mechanically, so to speak: when in the course of animal evolution the upright posture was definitely acquired by man, it became the point of departure for transformation of all the organs: when the head, instead of being carried by the powerful muscles at the back of the neck, as in the other animals, was supported by the spinal column, these muscles and the bones to which they are attached became modi-

fied, and with their modifications modified the skull, the brain, etc. When the layer of vegetable soil in a locality increases through any cause whatever, instead of bearing stunted plants it nourishes a forest, which increases the rainfall, which again increases the volume of the water courses, etc. But the parts of an artificial environment can react on each other only through the intermediary of man. The part modified must begin by transforming physically and mentally the men whom it causes to function, and must suggest to them the modifications which they must bring to the other parts to put them on the level of the progress realised in it, in order that they may not hinder it in its development, and in order that they may again correspond to it. The parts not modified manifest their inconvenience precisely by the useful qualities which formerly constituted their "good side," which by becoming superannuated are hurtful and then constitute so many "bad sides." They are the more insupportable according as the modifications which they should have undergone are more important. The re-establishment of the equilibrium in the parts of the artificial environment is often accomplished only after struggles between the men particularly interested in the part in course of transformation and the men concerned in the other parts.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Chas. H. Kerr.)

(To be Continued.)

Don't forget that our £1,000 Fund is still in existence and that the sooner we get the money the sooner you get Socialism.

READY SHORTLY.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

SIXTH EDITION,

WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence.

Post free, 3½d. per copy, from the S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

A TRIO OF "INTELLECTUALS."

Among the many developments that capitalism has brought to a high degree is the group of employees of the capitalists who carry out the various non-manual functions in modern society. This group comprises the managers, supervisors, lawyers, bankers, stockbrokers, journalists, politicians, in fact all those who love to describe themselves as "intellectuals."

Being, as a rule, better paid than the rest of the wage slaves, there is considerable competition for these jobs, with the result of an overcrowding of this particular market. For the moment we are only concerned with the position of two sections of this group.

One endeavours to obtain pay and position from the masters by pointing out the "dangers" of Socialism and so hoping to, more or less, scare the masters into engaging them for the purpose of exposing the "fallacies of Marx," etc. This section is found, largely, among the journalists and university professors.

The other section, failing in this pursuit, try to obtain a footing in the camp of the "common workers" and offer themselves as "guides," "leaders," "experts," etc. to the "lower orders."

A good example of a combination among individuals from both these sections has lately come our way.

In March 1883 Marx died. The next month an article was published in Italy purporting to be a biography of Marx. Apparently about 1916 this article was reprinted with some alterations and additions, as a pamphlet. This pamphlet was translated into English in 1918 as a great work from a wonderful professor who has made marvellous discoveries in economic and social science, some of whose works have been translated into English. Who is this giant and what are his works? Let the following quotation tell us.

Marx had hardly died when Mr. Achille Loria hastily published an article about him in the *Nouva Antologia* (April 1883). He starts out with a biography of Marx full of misinformation, and follows it up with a critique of Marx's public, political and literary activity. He misrepresents the materialist conception of history of Marx and twists it with an assurance which indicates a great purpose. And this purpose was later accomplished. In 1886 the same Mr. Loria published a book entitled *La teoria economica della costituzione politica* (The Economic Foundation of Society), in which he announced to his admiring contemporaries that the materialist conception of history which was so completely and purposely misrepresented by him in 1883, was his own discovery. True, the Marxian theory is reduced to a rather Philistine level in this book. And the historical illustrations and proofs abound in mistakes that would not be pardoned in a high school boy. But what does that matter? He

thinks that he has established his claim that the discovery that always and everywhere the political conditions and events are explained by the corresponding economic conditions was not made by Marx in 1845 but by Loria in 1886. At least, this is what he tried to make his countrymen believe, and also some Frenchmen, for his book has been translated into French. And now he can pose in Italy as the author of a new and epoch-making theory of history, until the Italian Socialists will find time to strip the *Illustrazione Loria* of his stolen peacock feathers.

But this is only an insignificant sample of Mr. Loria's style of doing things. He assures us that all of Marx's theories rest on conscious sophistry; that Marx was not above using false logic, even though he knew it to be so, etc. And after thus biasing his readers by a whole series of such contemptible insinuations, in order that they may regard Marx as just such an unprincipled upstart as Loria, accomplishing his effects by the same shameless and foul means as this professor from Padua, he has a very important secret for his readers, and incidentally he touches upon the rate of profit. (Engels' Preface to 3rd Volume of "Capital," pp. 28-26.)

We need not now discuss the highly technical point of the rate of profit. When Marx referred in Volume I. of "Capital" to the detailed working out of this problem in a future volume Mr. Loria seated that the problem was insoluble and that the promised volume would never appear. Yet when the second Volume of "Capital" was published, with Engels' challenge to the Robertians, Mr. Loria attempted to solve the insoluble by taking up the challenge. Even in this position he is a mere copyist. Another "great professor"—Bohm-Bawerk—had said that Marx had no solution, and that he would never publish the promised volume. Some years after saying so he was constrained to write a book entitled "Karl Marx and the Close of his System" against the volume he had said would never appear.

And in another point is the same practice followed. Mr. Loria takes the Malthusian theory of population and modifying it by taking (without acknowledgement) a part of Herbert Spencer's "New Theory of Population," presents the jumble as his own original discovery.

Of Loria's criticisms of Marx we need only refer to two statements made on consecutive pages. On page 67 he says:

It is undeniable that Marx's thesis of the progressive concentration of wealth into the hands of an ever-diminishing number of owners, and of the correlatively progressive impoverishment of the common people, has not been confirmed. It has indeed been confuted by the most authoritative statistics collected since the publication of the book.

On page 68 he says:

Again, no one can deny that the contrast between high grade and low grade incomes has of late exhibited an enormous increase; that banking concentration, and the sway of the banks over industry (a source of increasing disparity in fortunes) has attained in recent years an intensity which even

Marx could not foresee; and that subsequently to the publication of *Capital* and to the death of its author, the social fauna has been enriched by an economic animal of a species previously unknown, the multimillionaire, whose existence undeniably reveals an unprecedented advance in capitalist concentration. Agrarian and industrial concentration attained preposterous proportions such as he had never ventured to predict. In the American Union a single landed estate will embrace territories equal to entire provinces, while industrial capital becomes amassed by milliards in the hands of a few despotic trusts so that two-thirds of the entire working population are employed by one-twentieth of all the separate enterprises in the country.

We are told that this is a free country, so, having paid his half-crown for a ninety page pamphlet, one third of which consists of an introduction by the translators, the reader has full liberty to choose which of the above statements he will accept.

The introduction is worthy of the body of the pamphlet. The translators—Eden and Cedar Paul—are members of the second section of the "intellectuals" referred to above, who have condescended to come down among the common people and teach them how to achieve their emancipation. Possessing all the ignorance of the "educated," they lack none of their conceit. As an example we find on page 16 that they agree with Karl Pearson when he says:

"the acceptance of the law discovered by Malthus is an essential of any Socialistic theory which pretends to be scientific."

What is this "law discovered by Malthus"? Neither law nor discovery of his. Malthus stole certain ideas from Price, Wallace, and others and put them forward as his own. Reduced to a few words the "law" is that population increases in a geometrical ratio (2-4-8-16-32, etc.) while the means of subsistence increase only in arithmetical ratio (1-2-3-4-5, etc.) Hence the poverty of the working class is due entirely to there being more at Nature's table than Nature can feed. Our "intellectuals" say Lafargue, Henry George, and others who have endeavoured to meet the Malthusian difficulty "by a simple denial of the facts" have displayed more zeal than knowledge. The sentence quoted is a "simple" lie. Not simple denial, but complete exposure of the falsity of the so-called facts has been the work of these opponents. How ignorant "intellectuals" can be is shown by the following facts.

Malthus wrote his book partly as a general explanation of the misery prevalent in his day, and partly against Godwin's book, "Political Justice," that was an expression of revolt against that misery. Godwin wrote a crushing reply to Malthus entitled "On Population." Malthus, although he lived to edit five more editions of his work, made no attempt to meet

Godwin's exposure of his fallacies. Henry George in "Progress and Poverty" has taken Godwin's case and, adding further facts and evidence, discovered since Godwin wrote, has presented a reply that no Malthusian has been able to touch.

Not satisfied with Loria's falsifications of Marx, the translators try one themselves, though only by suggestion. On page 15 they quote Marx's criticism of Lassalle's "Iron Law of Wages" from the Gotha Programme. Marx had pointed out that the "Iron Law of Wages" rested upon the Malthusian theory of population, and said if this "law" were correct then it would be a waste of time to try and overthrow the system of wage labour as the "law" could not be overthrown and would assert itself under any system. He then pointed out that this was exactly the argument used by the hired apologists of the master class, who claimed that Socialism would merely make poverty universal because of this "law."

Now say our translators, "Does not it almost seem as if Marx by 1875, had, for a moment at least, glimpsed the real difficulty?"

To suggest that Marx "for a moment at least" accepted the truth of the Malthusian "law" whose falsities he had exposed shows not only the conceit of the people making the suggestion, but also their readiness to attempt to mislead those members of the working class who may read their introduction to Loria.

Further exposure of their ignorance is given in their reference to Loria's remarks on the neglect by Marxists of the great question of technical development. Loria says: "This physiology of industry which is now the least studied and least appreciated of Marx's labours nevertheless constitutes his most considerable and most enduring contribution to science."

The answer of the translators to this charge is to refer to William Paul's slovenly and inaccurate sketch of the State and to Newbold's journalistic articles as forming a reply. The splendid work of Lafargue, Kautsky, Sanial, and others in this field is evidently unknown to these intellectuals.

The value of the judgment of the translators on current events is clearly shown when on page 30 they refer to Workers' Committees—dead as a door nail to-day, except under the guise of the capitalist Whitley Councils—and Industrial Unionism, with its idiocy of proposing that unarmed men can beat the Army, as new forms of organisation for the working class.

Apart from the evidence it supplies of the ignorance and conceit of the "intellectuals" who contribute to its pages, the worth of the pamphlet to students of sociology is measured by the price of waste paper. J. FITZGERALD.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Mattheu-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 74 Mordock-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham. Branch meets Sat. at Coffee House, Spicall-st.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Com'ee. Applications to General Secy.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and last Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142 Balwar-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., 70 New-castle-st., Hulme, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Exmouth-St. Schools (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High-rd., Willesden-green, N.W.10.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy, J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Secy., 207 Derinton-rd., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets Fridays at 143 Beechcroft-rd., Upper Tooting at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Secy. C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 51 Greenleaf-rd., Walthamstow. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday. Visitors invited.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS.**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 192. Vol. 16.] LONDON, AUGUST, 1920. [MONTHLY, TWO PENCE

THE SUPER-OPPORTUNISTS

A CRITICISM OF BOLSHEVIST POLICY.

The Bolshevik leaders are opportunists. They start out with a definite programme and policy but change it completely when they find the world's workers do not support them. Lenin, Trotsky, Radek, and other officials denounced Kautsky, Henderson, Louget, and others for their reformist policy, but we now have Lenin and Zinoviev advising the Socialist workers of

England to take parliamentary action and join the Labour Party.

The report of the Executive of the Communist Party of Russia to the 1920 Congress of the Third International lays down the position that we should get inside the Parliamentary Labour parties. This advice is anti-Socialist, as anybody with a knowledge of the history and composition of the Labour parties know.

The Bolshevik leaders told us that the workers of the world were ripe for revolution and their support of Bolshevism was expected and depended upon. Now that it is plain that the workers do not understand Socialism and fight for it, Lenin is pandering to the ignorance of the world's workers. In defence he says that by supporting the pro-capitalist Labour Party and helping to establish a Labour Party government, the workers will learn the uselessness of the Labour parties. If that

The Logical Conclusion. policy is to be adopted, then it is necessary for the workers to follow every false road, to support every reaction-

ary measure, and to join every movement and learn from their mistakes—in other words, to exhaust every possible evil before they try the right road. If this policy is right why did not Lenin support Kerensky's policy of capitalism for Russia and let the workers painfully learn its uselessness? Such nonsense

as supporting parties and Governments to gain power to learn their misdeeds is not the road to Socialism, it is the path to apathy and despair, and lengthens capitalism's life.

After spending much ink and eloquence in denouncing parliamentary action Lenin tells us in his interview in the "Manchester Guardian" that it is necessary in modern capitalist countries.

In his telegram to the British Socialist Party Lenin calls upon them to support parliamentary action by means of a Labour party. After all the attempts of Lenin to show that Marx and Engels believed in the smashing and not using of the State power, Trotsky tells us in "A Paradise for the Workers" that we have to get control of the State power and use it instead of abolishing it. Radek in his "Communism—From Science to Action," denounced parliamentary action and majority rule, but in a recent letter to a German Communist he completely changes round and advises parliamentary action.

Lenin, in his letter to the German party, supports Parliamentary Action and the winning of the masses in defiance of all his previous advice and his previous praise of the Spartacan minority action. The Amsterdam Bureau of the

The Opportunist Weathercocks. Third International was abolished because it told the English Socialists not to engage in Parliamentary Action or to support the Labour Party. All this demonstrates the absence of any principle and simply the desire to veer with the changing winds.

We have been denounced for our attitude of insisting upon the need of Socialists making a revolutionary use of parliaments. Our position, however, was based upon Socialist principles

and a recognition of the facts of history, not a desire to pander to popular prejudices such as support of a dangerous and fraudulent Labour party.

We have opposed Kautsky's reformism and opportunism because it is not Socialism and is against the principle of the Class Struggle. We are equally opposed to dangerous teachings if they come from Lenin, Radek, or any other man who sets himself up as a teacher of Socialism. Our position is that taken up by Marx and Engels and made plain by them in their writings. Engels says in his last (1890) preface to the Communist Manifesto that we must gain the minds of the masses. Bolshevism, however, has depended for its triumph upon the minority, who ignored the majority of workers. So true is this that Radek in his pamphlet ridicules anything else in minority action for Socialism.

Bertram Russell, who accompanied the Labour delegation to Russia in June records his interview with Lenin in the "Nation" (July 10th and 17th), and Lenin there admits the opposition of the peasantry. Lenin in reply to Kautsky ("The Dictatorship and the Betrayer Kautsky") does not attempt to deny Kautsky's charge that Menshevik and Social-Revolutionary delegates to Soviets were suppressed in order to maintain Bolshevik majorities. Russell states that the Soviets are moribund and that any other delegates than Bolshevik ones are denied railway passes and so cannot attend the Soviet meetings. He also says that the All Russian Soviet meets seldom, that the recall is exercised for minor offences, such as drunkenness, and that the delegates continually ignore their constituents. We do not accept Russell as an authority, but much of his report agrees with Bolshevik writings.

We have always contended that the Bolsheviks could only maintain power by resorting to capitalist devices. History has shown us to be correct. The January 1920 Congress of Executive Communists in Russia abolished the power of workers control in factories and installed officials instructed by Moscow and given controlling influence. Their resolutions printed in most of the Labour papers and the "Manchester Guardian" here show how economic backwardness has produced industrial conscription with heavy penalties for unpunctuality, etc. The abolition of democracy in the army was decreed long ago, but now that the army is being converted by Trotsky into a labour army it means rule from the top with an iron hand.

Russia has agreed to repay foreign property-owners their losses and allied Governments their "debts." This means continued exploitation of Russian workers to pay foreign exploiters.

With all the enthusiasm of the Communists they find themselves faced with the actual conditions in Russia and the ignorance of the greater part of its population.

There is no easier road to Socialism than the education of the workers in Socialism and their organisation to establish it by democratic methods. Russia has to learn that. A. K.

HOLIDAYS AND TOIL.

The holiday season is here, and a great exodus of holiday makers is to be seen at every great terminus. The tired toilers everywhere are—where they can—making frantic efforts to obtain a little of the imperative relaxation for the human machine. Nature demands it! Capitalism, as it develops, exacts more and ever more of the physical and mental make-up of the individual wage-slave and his class. Body, brain and nerve, under the present system, have an ever-increasing strain thrust upon them by the exacting demands of a ruthless system of exploitation and production for profit.

The consequence is that not only individual workers, but our wage-slave class, are automatically worn out quicker. They are the speedier thrown onto the industrial scrap-heap of unemployment, discarded like an orange from which all the best has been withdrawn. They are the sooner smitten with disease, and the more frequently overtaken by death prematurely. These are some of the "rare and refreshing fruits" of capitalism which cunningly-framed insurance Bills are powerless to cope with. Karl Marx pointed out with his usual profound insight, that it suits the capitalists' interests better to have a virile generation that they can exploit intensively, and, through that, wear out quicker, than a generation which they can only exploit at a slower rate. The pace kills! But in the race for wealth human beings are given by our masters less consideration than they bestow upon their racehorses.

In some cavalry exercises in the South of England a young soldier and his horse met with an accident. The horse stumbled and broke his fetlock, and the man was thrown and broke his collar-bone and leg. Several soldiers hastened to the injured man's assistance. "Never mind him! Look after the horse!" the officer shouted. "We can get men any day; the horse cost £50!"

That is true, as it was told me, and reveals a similar attitude to that displayed by our exploiters.

The "Great War" (how long will it be ere a greater is organised?) showed the utter callousness of the capitalist class. The lives of the

workers were considered of no account to the workers themselves by our war-makers. They were only of value as they served our masters' purposes as pawns to fight and die for capitalist interests alone.

And in "peace" it is just the same: the working class are used as mere human machines for the production of surplus value. They are TOILERS! They have to drudge. Their work, which would be only a means to an end under a sensible system of society, is for millions a relentless slavery. The damnable monotony of it, the harsh conditions and blighting effect of it upon mind and nerve and body are disastrous to our class.

Work should be a joyous exercise of all the necessary faculties brought to bear upon some socially useful purpose. It should not be unduly prolonged, and even if it is laborious it should be tempered to the worker.

Under capitalism every ounce that can be is daily wrung out of the wage slave. This is the result of having a system where the very means of life are in the hands of, and controlled by, a class.

We work far too long and far too often! Why? Because all that the masters can compel us to produce beyond what they pay us in wages goes into their pockets, and it is only for this that the masters allow us to use the means of production in their possession. The surplus-value thus produced through a fleecing wages system permits a class of parasites to riot in luxury. They can make holiday all the year round, till holiday bores them with ennui. Wintering at Cannes or squandering at Monte Carlo, they know that "money will come in" because their wage-slaves are toiling for them. The "London Season" sees them luxuriating in "Town"; later they flaunt at Ascot, and in the exquisite villas at Maidenhead, and to the moors they go for grouse-shooting. And they do it all while their slaves are toiling, and on the wealth which these latter so painfully produce.

There are thousands upon thousands of workers who are annually quite unable to scrape together enough to go for a much-needed rest and change at the seaside. Capitalism denies them the opportunity!

Socialism alone will ensure to all, not only every means, in abundance, necessary to physical well-being, but every opportunity for rest and recreation. Under Socialism the workers will not live to work for exploiters, for class rule will not exist.

At present the working class only exist to serve a sordid purpose—the interests of capitalism. GRAHAM MAY.

THE RETURN OF THE PRODIGAL.

Before the world went mad—when it was only stupid, the Socialist was wont to be met by certain stock phrases and arguments with such regularity and persistence that they became as familiar to him as old friends.

The man in the street used to be perturbed by the problem: "If you eliminate the capitalist who will pay my wages?" The capitalist defenders of their system in their turn argued that since they paid the wages of the working class (or as they would have it, working classes) the capitalists are as indispensable to humanity as the sun is to the universe.

But then the International capitalist gang quarrelled over the spoils of the exploitation of the working class, and the man in the street ceased to worry about wages under Socialism and went forth to do battle or to dodge it. Consequently the old familiar phrases went amissing too.

It was, therefore like meeting again an old acquaintance whom we have missed from amongst us to come across the following which appeared in a report of the speech of the Chairman of Crosses and Winkworths Consolidated Mills at a shareholders' meeting:

Money—capital is the very vein matter of industry. Without it the commercial life of this or any other country must cease. Labour is dependent on employment, and employment is furnished by the people who are able to put up the money to pay wages. The excess profit duty of 60 per cent. at one fell swoop snatches away £300,000,000 a year that would otherwise be invested in production. Instead of being paid out in dividends and reinvested in some producing concern, this gigantic sum of money will be withdrawn from its proper use in order to meet the bills on armaments, or shipping control, or the Civil Service. What can this mean but so much the less development and growth of industry, so much the less production, and, in consequence, so much the less employment? Secondly, Labour must depend to a very large extent on the establishment of new enterprise. But this [duty makes it impossible for any new business to be set up in competition with old-established firms. A certain number, a growing number, among the leaders of industry are raising their voices against this tax. But, as a matter of fact, they are doing so only because they are long-sighted enough to see what it means to themselves as well as to every one else in the end. There are many manufacturers who appear to be incapable of realising so much, and who almost welcome these proposals as being the finest protective wall that they could have wished to have erected. The concessions promised to the new man must be very great indeed to give him a chance against the old-established concern. Unless I am completely wrong, this tax must surely stifle enterprise and the creation of new business. Once

more, so much the less production and so much the less employment.

It would be but reiteration to prove that Sir Edward Mackay, the chairman in question, has in common with all the apologists of the present system, got the cart before the horse. We have shown in these columns time and time again that it is wage-labour that creates capital and not vice-versa. Furthermore, capital cannot increase unless it beget a new supply of wage-labour for fresh exploitation. All that mankind needs to maintain its existence is the application of human labour-power to the nature-given material. The function that the capitalist performs in the present system is that, having regard to the fact that capital is his personal property, he is in a position to expropriate the products of labour, returning only a portion, barely enough to keep it in existence, to the working class. That portion is called wages.

Edgar, however, is quite an altruist. He tries to make it clear that he is not solely concerned about himself. Despite the fact that, as he says:

We are in a first-rate position, earning good money, and have an order book filled for seven months ahead at profitable prices. Our cotton position is excellent.

he is anxious to prevent Labour from doing itself an injury,

We have lately had a readjustment of wages in the trade, and certain operatives are now earning sums that were undreamt of prior to the war. I would be the last to oppose any legitimate demands based on the rise in living cost, and none of us will deny that the workers should benefit by the prosperity of the trade in which they are engaged. Before the war in many cases labour was underpaid. It was inevitable that when they were presented with an opportunity of getting on terms with their employers they should seize it with both hands. But now one can see signs that the great body of intelligent workers are beginning to realise that the policy of grab, of squeezing the employer to the limit, is more than likely to react on Labour itself if carried any further. Appetite comes by eating, and demands in many trades have reached such a point that to-day many of the responsible trades union leaders and the great army of sensible—hard, common-sensible workers are beginning to realise the danger, and are not a little frightened at the greedy monster they have raised. It is a truism that Capital and Labour are interdependent. We are all in the same boat—a boat labouring against a head wind and a heavy sea.

Such kind-hearted consideration must surely make us Socialists feel a little ashamed of ourselves for wanting to deprive the capitalist class of its sole means of existence. But I am afraid we are a flint-hearted crowd and Edgar's appeal to "the great army of sensible workers" leaves us cold.

We have met our Edgars before and know

them for what they are worth. But the man in the street, what is he thinking about? Will he still worry about wages under Socialism, or who it is that is to do the dirty work? In any case, however, the Socialist has an answer to every question, new or old, and if the returned prodigal questions are only accompanied by a real desire for enlightenment the man in the street will soon discover that Socialism is the only system of society that will secure him as the fruits of his labour far more than anything his wages under capitalism can bring him. And our cotton magnates will soon receive their *conge* together with the rest of the parasite class who draw dividends from the blood and sweat of the working class and insult them with their hypocritical "consideration." S. H. S.

CAPITALISM'S ADMIR- ABLE CRICHTONS.

One of J. M. Barrie's immortal plays portrays the butler who by sheer force of superior mentality and ability assumed leadership over his aristocratic employers when shipwrecked on a desert island. The position is intended to be a more or less fanciful one, but in reality present day society teems with examples of the repression of great minds by the mediocre-minded few. Many of us in even our small circles can point to one or two acquaintances who can find no outlet for really brilliant intelligences, and who are forced by stress of economic circumstance to spend their lives in uncongenial work and uninspiring environment. History has many cases to show of genius which has been discovered too late, of great minds that have been starved of opportunity. Men and women who, even under adverse conditions, managed to leave something behind that humanity is the better for, have in countless cases died of want and hopeless despair. The painting that might fetch a small fortune at Christie's to-day perhaps was sold by the artist for the price of a loaf of bread. The machine that may make a modern Croesus was invented by one whose life was one long struggle against penury and who died, as he had lived, in obscurity.

Many more must there be who have no opportunity of bringing into the light ideas that would stamp them as being more than ordinary men. Who could expect a man to come back, after a long day's toil, to a miserable hovel, surrounded by those scenes and noises which are so great a part of the worker's environment, and to sit down and compose beautiful music, or paint a masterpiece, or write a treatise that should make history?

All that matters to-day is the ability to make

a profit—if that be ability. Very few employers are more intelligent than some of their own machine-minders, but the fact that the machines belong to them and not to the minders is sufficient to obtain for them the comfort and luxury that the latter and their families are not even able to dream of. Even their vaunted "directive ability" is vested in managers and foremen. We had the case recently of an American millionaire who made a fortune while in the madhouse! He, like the rest of his class, could not help it. It requires practically no effort on their part. That is the irony of it all. If ability counted they would not be in the position they are in. The working class invent machinery, they work machinery, they pay their own meagre wages, and hand the surplus to the employers. There is not an operation from the loading of a trolley to the cashing of a cheque that is not performed by a member of the working class.

The position, however, never seems to strike the workers themselves. If a man is a good workman and boasts about it he will compare himself with his neighbour, but never with his employer. In the same way he is familiar with and deferential to names like Rothschild and Rockefeller, but of Faraday and Pasteur, who have benefited society almost as much as the first-named have harmed it, he has not the faintest notion.

It is true of capitalism more than of any other system of society that the good in men does not pay so much as the bad. It is more to the advantage of doctors to pander to the fanciful notions of old dowagers with well-lined purses than it is for them to devote their lives to endeavouring to cure some dread disease. It is useless for a man to invent something that would make workmen in a particularly dangerous occupation safer if it would mean adding to the employer's establishment expenses.

Only under Socialism will every man find it to his advantage to give of his best, since it will be the community that will benefit and not the pockets of the few. The machine that will run faster will not throw men out of work as at present, but will, as it should, reduce the hours of labour. Scientists will not experiment with poison gases and explosives, but will use their knowledge in protecting the human race and bringing health and strength to those that lack it. And what is more, the man in the street, the common worker, instead of being any longer the slave of toil, with only "a soul to be damned, a body to be kicked," will become a responsible member of society with a right to all that the world has to offer and with no man to say him nay. S. H. S.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY

Reformers and revolutionists have from time immemorial been the recipients of that deep antagonism inherent in the brain of man towards any form whatsoever of ideas or actions detrimental to those at the time prevailing. History tells us that the advance of man from the savage state to the degree of intelligence of man to-day has been a gradual evolution from one stage to another. The germs of the actions which will govern the future state of mankind always being found in the previous state, make themselves felt among the people concerned, until at last conditions are ripe for a process of discarding the old and establishing the new. The Socialist, having studied these facts, recognises that no waving of red flags, plotting against governments, or such futilities, can bring about the coming advancement from Capitalism to Socialism, his object being to disseminate amongst his fellow men ideas regarding the position in which they are to-day relative to that which they could attain were they only to concentrate their minds on matters which affect their welfare and overcome that primitive opposition to ideas which aim at changing the present system of society.

By virtue of the present system itself society is unsocial in every aspect of the word. With regard to the methods of production, so long as the worker is maintained on a scale of living which is consistent with his efficiency as a worker no consideration is given to his social life. He is not considered as a member of society privileged to enjoy its pleasures, but rather just as a "hand," a mere tool to be used how, when, and where the master requires.

For example, with regard to the recent report in the papers anent a mid-week football match, the promoters were asked to discontinue mid-week football, not because watching football was detrimental to the eyesight of the spectators or society at large, but because "profits" were being lost to shareholders.

The Socialist does not desire to impose any rules or conditions on society. All he asks is that society will consciously apply principles for the benefit of society as a whole, entirely eliminating any question of class distinction, thereby directly being the means of man recognising that he has no reason to humble himself to anyone. Servility and humility are but the primitive acts of religious superstition, fostered by Press and pulpit in an endeavour to blind the workers to the stern reality that while capitalism continues its course the poverty of the workers must become continually greater.

No reforms or palliatives can possibly improve

the condition of the working class for any period, it is the wages system that is the cause of all the ills which are rampant to-day, and until that system is abolished the Socialist can confidently prophesy that the condition of the working class will gradually become worse. Speeding up production in an effort to secure greater profits, choke the warehouses with the goods produced by the workers; unemployment becomes more intense, and, in the struggle for markets, war becomes a necessity of the system. And the cycle goes on only with greater intensity.

Socialism is the only system yet advanced which claims to offer humanity a world devoid of poverty. The only party in Great Britain advocating Socialism is the S.P.G.B., and while various freak parties glitter in the light of publicity only to fade away, the Socialist Party steadily gains ground. A. J. S.

OUR MANIFESTO IS OUT.

We were not in a position when we went to press with our last issue to announce that the new edition of the "Manifesto of the Socialist Party of Great Britain" was ready for sale, although before the July number was published the "Manifesto" was actually in the hands of the public. We have had to prepare a large edition in order to be able to sell the book at 3d. without financial loss, so comrades should push the sale to the utmost.

The special preface to the edition covers the extremely important ground of the actions of the so-called Socialist parties during the period of, and in relation to, the recent world war, and it should be brought into prominent and special notice in all working-class circles. It will undoubtedly become a valuable weapon in the fight for Socialism.

OUR £1,000 FUND.

Once again we draw attention to the urgent need for the "sinews of war." Though we do not care to spare a great deal of our spare for appeals for funds, the need is not on that account any the less pressing or vital. There is much work awaiting the financial means to enable it to go forward, and all who are possibly able to do so should send regular donations to our £1,000 Fund. In particular those who are unable to take part in the direct active work of the Party should make a special effort to support the efforts of their comrades through this medium. A further list will be published in due course—don't let your name be missing from it.

AN INTERESTING DOCUMENT. WHY JACK LONDON RESIGNED FROM THE S.P. OF AMERICA.

We reproduce below the letter by which the well-known novelist, Jack London, resigned his membership of the Socialist Party of America. It is of interest as showing how far he was from taking up the position which his widow afterwards embraced, and which she declared would have been his position had he lived.

Honolulu,
7th March, 1916.

Dear Comrades,

I am resigning from the Socialist Party of America because of its lack of fire and fight and its loss of emphasis on the Class Struggle.

I was originally a member of the old up-on-its-hind-legs-fighting-Socialist Party. Since then and up to the present time, I have been a fighting member of the Socialist Party of America. My fighting record in the cause is not even at this late date entirely forgotten. Trained in the Class Struggle as taught and practiced by the Socialist Labour Party,—my own highest judgment concurring,—I believed that the working class, by fighting, by never fusing, by never making terms with the enemy, could emancipate itself. Since the whole trend of Socialism in the United States of America during recent years has been one of peaceableness and compromise, I find that my mind refuses further sanction of my remaining a Party member.

Please include my Comrade wife, Charmian K. London's resignation with mine.

My final word is that liberty, freedom, and independence are royal things that cannot be presented to, nor thrust upon, races or classes. If races and classes cannot rise up by their strength of brain and brawn, wrest from the world liberty, freedom and independence, they never in time can come to these royal possessions, and if such royal things are kindly presented to them by superior individuals on silver platters, they will know not what to do with them, will fail to make use of them, and will be what they have always been in the past—inferior races and inferior classes.

Yours for the Revolution,

JACK LONDON.

(From the "Overland Monthly," Nov. 1917.)

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

AN UNUSUAL FRIENDSHIP

The victory of Marx's career was not only due to the man's enormous power. According to all human probability, he would have succumbed sooner or later, if he had not found in Engels a friend, of whose self-sacrificing fidelity we have no accurate picture until the publication of the correspondence of the two men.

No other such spectacle is afforded in all recorded history. Couples of friends, of historical importance, are found throughout history, and German history has its examples also. Frequently their life-work is so closely interwoven that it is difficult to decide which accomplishment belongs to each one of them. But always there has been a persistent remnant of individual obstinacy or stubbornness, or perhaps only an instinctive reluctance to surrender his own personality, which, in the words of the poet, "is the highest blessing of the children of men." After all, Luther saw in Melancthon only a chicken-livered scholar, while Melancthon regarded Luther as a coarse peasant. And in the correspondence of Goethe and Schiller, anyone with sound senses can discern the secret lack of attunement between the great Privy Councillor and the small Court Councillor. There was no trace of this ultimate human weakness in the friendship of Marx and Engels: the more their thoughts and labors became interwoven, the more each one of them remained a full man, complete in himself.

Their exteriors were quite different. Engels, a blonde Teuton of tall stature, of English manners, as an observer once said of him, always well dressed, with a bearing that was rigid with the training not only of the barracks, but also of the counting-house. With six clerks, he said, he would organise a branch of the administration a thousand times more simple and efficient than with sixty Government Councillors, who cannot even write legibly and get your books all balled up, so that the Devil himself can make nothing of them. A member of the Manchester Stock Exchange, perfectly respectable in the business dealings and the amusements of the English bourgeoisie, its fox-hunts and its Christmas parties, he was yet a tireless mental worker and fighter, who, in a little house on the outskirts of the city, held his treasure concealed, his little Irish girl, in whose arms he would refresh himself whenever he tired of the human turmoil in the world without.

Marx, on the other hand, thick-set, with flashing eyes and a lion's mane of ebony hue, betraying his Semetic origin; of careless exterior, a father, whose family cares alone would be sufficient to keep him away from the social life

of the great city; so intensely devoted to consuming intellectual labour that he has hardly the time to gulp down a hasty dinner and uses up his bodily strength to all hours of the night; a tireless thinker to whom thought is a supreme pleasure; in this respect a genuine successor of Kant, of Fichte, and particularly of Hegel, whose sentence he loved to repeat: "Even the most criminal thought of a scoundrel is more sublime and more magnificent than the miracles of the celestial sphere," but differing from them in that his thoughts inexorably drive him to action, he was impractical in small matters, but very practical in large matters; far too helpless to arrange a petty household, but incomparably capable in the business of recruiting and leading an army that was to revolutionize the world.

If it is true that "the style is the man," we must also note their differences as writers. Each in his way was a master of language, a linguistic genius, with a mastery of many foreign languages and even of individual dialects. In this field Engels was even more remarkable than Marx, but whenever writing in his mother-tongue, even in his letters, and of course in his writings, he exercises a most austere care to keep the language free from all foreign admixture of word and phrase, without falling, however, into the vagaries of the patriotic linguistic purists. He wrote with ease and lucidity, always in a style so pellucid that you looked right down to the bottom of the current of his animated speech.

Marx's style was at once more careless and more difficult. In his youthful letters there is still apparent, as in those of Heine, a condition of struggle with the language, and in the letters of his later years, particularly after his settlement in England, he began to make use of a picturesque jargon of German, English and French, all mixed up. In his published writings, also, there is an over liberal use of foreign words, and there is no lack of Gallisms and Anglicisms, yet he is so distinctly a master of the German language that he cannot be translated without loss. Once when Engels had read a chapter by Marx in a French translation, even after Marx had revised the translation, it seemed to Engels that all the vigor and sap and life had disappeared. Goethe once wrote to Frau von Stein: "In metaphors I am ready to stand comparison with the proverbs of Sancho Panza." Marx could easily bear comparison with the greatest of the world's adepts in figures of speech, with Lessing, Goethe, Hegel, so full of life and vigour is his language.

(Continued on page 189.)

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free ...	2s. 6d.
Six " " " " " " " " " " " "	1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard,

SUNDAY,



AUG. 1, 1920.

BIRTHDAY HONOURS.

With this number we complete the sixteenth volume of our Party Organ, the *SOCIALIST STANDARD*. During the sixteen years through which we have run our journal we have had trying times—times which have been as severe tests, both of political solidity and of determination to survive, as we are likely to encounter short of the final struggle of the Revolution, and we have come through with unsmirched banner and untarnished record. There have been many hands at the helm, but as time has removed some and brought others to the labour the changes have left no discernable mark upon our pages. Just as we have found no occasion to alter one word of the Declaration of Principles which has appeared in each copy we have sent out, so, no matter what changes have taken place in the personnel of our staff, what editors have come and gone, what successive Executives have taken control, in all things that matter our paper has remained unchanged. The reason for this is not far to seek—they have all done their work under a sound Declaration of Principles, published to the world, a guide alike for those within to work by, and for those without to test that work by.

So through these years we have held on our course without deviation, true to every clause, every statement, every affirmation, of the guiding principles under which our journal was launched. Others have tried all manner of shifts and dodges to find a short cut, or even to snatch personal advantage for interested controllers. We, however, sure of the correct-

ness of our claim that there is no royal road to Socialism, no other path than the hard and steep one of working-class revolutionary education, no other helpful policy than that based on the Class Struggle, have resolutely and consistently left such expedients to those others, content to have them provide our object lessons for us.

For our part we still proclaim that the proletariat must want Socialism before they can establish it, and that they must understand Socialism before they can want it; we still assert that society is divided into two classes—a master class and an enslaved class—with diametrically opposed interests, and that the freedom of the enslaved class can only be the fruits of victory in a class struggle; we still declare that the basis of society as at present constituted, is the private ownership of the means of living, and that reforms—anything in fact short of the abolition of private ownership in the means of living, and the establishment of common ownership in its stead—must be futile and utterly helpless to effect amelioration of the general condition of the workers' position; we still preach that the road to this overthrow of the present social system lies in the capture of the political machinery, and we are as emphatically insistent as ever upon the point that the means to such end are already in the hands of the workers in their possession of the vast bulk of the voting power in all advanced capitalist countries.

Such being our beliefs we have shaped our policy sternly in accordance therewith. We have set our faces against compromises of every shape and form. We have refused to have anything to do with reforms, no matter how alluring they appeared, or how much they ran in the popular fancy. We have conducted all our activities in the light of the class struggle, keeping clear the issue—the overthrow of the dominant capitalist class and the system under which they dominate.

This policy has not been without its reward. The sickening records of the pseudo-Socialist parties become increasingly malodiferous in the nostrils of thoughtful working men and women, and as our exposures drive, and historical events draw, these renegade parties into the open, and force them more and more to reveal themselves as the anti-Socialists they are, our clean record is appealing to increasing numbers. The demand for our Party Organ, notwithstanding the smaller facilities for disposing of it at our disposal, is greater at the close of the sixteenth volume than it has ever been, a fact which has its reflection in greater enquiry for our application for membership forms and a steady enrolment of new members.

THE HISTORICAL METHOD OF MARX.

REPRINTED FROM THE "INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW,"

OCT., 1907.

IV.**The Natural Environment and the Artificial or Social Environment—Continued.**

A few historical facts, too recent to be forgotten, will illustrate the interplay of the various parts of the artificial environment through the medium of man.

When industry had utilised the elasticity of steam as a motor power, it demanded new means of transportation to carry its fuel, its raw material and its products. It suggested to the interested manufacturers the idea of steam traction on iron rails which began to be practiced in the coal fields of Gard in 1830 and in the those of the Loire in 1832; it was in 1829 that Stephenson's first locomotive drew a train in England. But when it was desired to extend this mode of locomotion, active and various opposition was encountered, which delayed its development for years. M. Thiers, one of the authorised representatives of its common sense and public opinion, opposed it energetically, because, he declared, "a railroad can not work." Railroads, indeed, upset the most reasonable an established ideas: they required, along with other impossible things, grave changes in the mode of property-serving as a basis for the social edifice of the bourgeoisie then in power. Till then a capitalist created an industry or a mercantile establishment with his own money, increased, at the most, by that of one or two friends and acquaintances who had confidence in his honesty and skill; he directed the use of the funds and was the real and nominal proprietor of the factory or the commercial house. But the railroads were obliged to amass such enormous capitals that it was therefore necessary to induce a great number of capitalists to confide their money, which they had never left out of their sight, to people whose names they scarcely knew, still less their ability or morality. When they let go of the money they lost all control over its use; they had no personal proprietorship in the stations, cars, locomotives, etc., which it served to create; instead of pieces of gold and silver, having volume, weight and other solid qualities, they received back a narrow, light sheet of paper, representing fictitiously an intangible morsel of the collective property, the name of which it

bore, printed in big letters. Never in bourgeois memory had property taken on such a metaphysical form. This new form, which *depersonalised* property, was in such violent contradiction with that which summed up the joys of the capitalists, that which they had known and handed down for generations, that to defend it and propagate it no one could be found but the men charged with all the crimes and denounced as the worst disturbers of social order,—the Socialists. Fourier and St. Simon welcomed the mobilisation of property in paper stock-certificates. We find in the ranks of their disciples the manufacturers, engineers and financiers who prepared the revolution of 1848 and were the plotters of December 2: they profited by the political revolution to revolutionise the economic environment by centralising the nine provincial banks into the Bank of France, by legalising the new form of property and causing it to be accepted by public opinion, and by creating the network of French railways.

The great mechanical industry, which must draw its fuel and its raw material from a distance, and which must scatter its products widely, cannot tolerate the parcelling of a nation into little autonomous States, with tariffs, laws, weights and measures, coins, paper currencies, etc., of their own; it requires, on the contrary, the development of unified and centralised nations. Italy and Germany have met these requirements of the great industry, but only at the cost of bloody wars. MM. Thiers and Proudhon, who had numerous points of resemblance, and who represented the political interests of the little industry, became ardent defenders of the independence of the States of the Church and the Italian princes.

Since man successively creates and modifies the parts of the social environment, therefore, in him reside the motive forces of history,—so Vico and popular wisdom hold, rather than in Justice, Progress, Liberty, and other metaphysical entities, as the most philosophical historians stupidly repeat. These confused and inexact ideas vary according to the historical epochs and according to the groups or even the individuals of the same epoch; for they are the mental reflections of the phenomena produced in the different parts of the artificial environment; for example, the capitalist, the magistrate, and the wage-worker have different ideas of Justice. The Socialist understands by justice the restitution to the wage-working producers of the wealth which has been stolen from them, while to the capitalist justice is the conservation of this stolen wealth, and as the latter possesses the economic and political power, his notion predominates and makes the law, which, for the

magistrate, becomes justice. Precisely because the same word covers contradictory notions, the capitalist class has made of these ideas an instrument of deceit and of dominance.

That portion of the artificial or social environment in which a man functions gives him a physical, intellectual, and moral education. This education by things, which engenders ideas in him and excites his passions, is unconscious; so when he acts, he imagines he is following freely the impulses of his passions and ideas, while he is only yielding to the influences exercised on him by one of the parts of the artificial environment, which can react on the other parts only through the intermediary of his ideas and passions. Obeying instinctively the indirect pressure of the environment, he attributes the direction of his actions and emotion to a God, a divine intelligence, or to ideas of Justice, Progress, Humanity, etc. If the march of history is unconscious, since as Hegel says, man always finishes with a result other than that which he sought, it is because thus far he has been unconscious of the cause which makes him act and directs his actions.

What is the most unstable part of the social environment, that which is changed oftenest in quantity and quality, that which is most apt to disturb the whole?

The mode of production; answers Marx.

By mode of production Marx means not what is produced but the way of producing it; thus there has been weaving from pre-historic times, but it is only for about a century that there has been machine weaving. Machine production is the essential characteristic of modern industry. We have under our eyes an unparalleled example of its terrible and irresistible power to transform the social, economic, political and legal institutions of a nation. Its introduction into Japan has lifted that country in one generation from the feudal state of the middle ages into the constitutional state of the capitalist world, and has placed it in the front rank of world powers.

Multiple causes unite in assuring to the mode of production this omnipotence of action. Production absorbs, directly or indirectly, the energy of an immense majority of the individuals of a nation, while in the other parts constituting the social environment (politics, religion, literature, etc.) a slender minority is occupied, and even this minority can not but be interested in procuring the means of existence, material and intellectual. Consequently all men undergo mentally and physically, more or less, the modifying influence of the mode of production, while but a very small number of men are subjected to that of the other portions:

now, as it is through the intermediary of men that the different parts of the social environment act on each other, that which modifies the most men possesses of necessity the most energy for moving the whole mass.

The mode of production, relatively unimportant in the social environment of the savage, takes on a preponderant and ever-growing importance through the incessant incorporation into production of the forces of nature, in proportion as man learns to know them: prehistoric man began this incorporation by using stones for weapons and tools.

Progress in the mode of production is relatively rapid, not only because production occupies an enormous mass of men, but again because, by enkindling "three fires of private interest," it puts in play the three vices which, for Vico, are the moving forces of history,—hardheartedness, avarice and ambition.

Progress in the mode of production has become so headlong for the last two centuries that the men interested in production must constantly remodel the corresponding parts of the social environment to keep them on the level; the resistances which they encounter give rise to incessant conflicts, economic and political. Thus, to discover the first causes of historic movements, we must seek them in the mode of production of material life, which, as Marx says, dominates in general the development of the social, political, and intellectual life.

Marx's economic determinism takes away from Vico's law of the unity of historical development its character of predetermination, which would carry the idea that the historic phrases through which a nation passes, like the embryonic phrases of an animal, are as Geoffrey Saint-Hilaire thought, indissolubly linked to its very nature and determined by the inevitable action of an inner force, an "evolutionary force," which would conduct it along pre-established paths toward ends marked out in advance; whence it would follow that all nations must progress, always and whether or no, at an equal pace and along one and the same path. The law of the unity of development, thus conceived, would be verified by the development of not one nation.

History, on the contrary, shows nations as they are, some limping through certain stages of evolution, which others traverse like race-horses, while others again go back from stages already reached. These delays, progressions, and recessions are explained only when we examine the social, political, and intellectual history of the several nations in the light of the history of the artificial environments in which

they have evolved, the changes in these environments, determined by the mode of production, determine in their turn historic events.

Since artificial environments are transformed only at the cost of national and international struggles, the historic events of a nation are thus subjected to relations which arise between the artificial environment to be transformed and the nation, fashioned as it has been by its natural environment and its hereditary and acquired characteristics. The natural environment and the historic past have impressed upon each nation certain original characteristics; so it follows that the same mode of production does not produce, with mathematical exactness, the same artificial or social environments, and consequently does not occasion historical events absolutely alike in different nations and at all moments of history, since vital international competition increases and intensifies in proportion to the growth in the number of nations arriving at the higher stages of civilisation. The historic evolution of nations, then, is not predetermined, any more than the embryonic evolution of individuals: if it passes through similar organisations of family, property, law, and politics, and through analogous forms of thought in philosophy, religion, art, and literature, it is because nations, whatever their race and geographical habitat, experience in their development material and intellectual wants which are substantially alike and must inevitably resort, for the satisfaction of these wants, to the same methods of production.

PAUL LAFARGUE.

(Translated by Chas. H. Kerr.)

(Conclusion.)

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

SIXTH EDITION,

WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence.

Post free, 3½d. per copy, from the S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

SOFT SOAP FOR LEVER-HULME.

There is much confusion in the minds not only of the rank and file of the organised workers, but also among their most prominent leaders with regard to the forces that make for Socialism. Those forces may be divided under two heads. First, the discovery and general dispersion of Socialist knowledge, and second, the general development of the capitalist system, which constantly tends to place the social organism out of harmony with its surroundings. The first is by far the more important at the moment, because the second has already reached a stage where its results are seen on every hand: poverty in the midst of plenty, and endless disputes over the distribution of wealth that threaten to plunge all human society into chaos and anarchy.

A system of society in which wealth does not belong to those who produce it may for a long time be borne with patience by the producers, if it does not impose any great hardships on the majority. The fact that with increased powers of production and a greater expenditure of energy poverty becomes more acute, is excused and partly hidden by the current belief that wealth cannot be produced except for markets. The imperative necessity—from the capitalist standpoint—for ever cheaper methods of production, coupled with the insatiable greed of the master class, breeds antagonism everywhere between the two classes in society. The competition between combines and groups of capitalists wipes out large numbers of smaller capitalists and leaves the bulk of wealth-producing concerns in the possession of a dwindling number of financiers.

Whether the means of wealth-production are owned and controlled by a capitalist class large or small in numbers, the interests of that class are always opposed to Socialism. It is even possible that, as the capitalist class grows smaller in numbers they may be able to combat Socialism more successfully because of the greater ease with which they could agree upon, and set in motion, antagonistic forces.

The growing antagonism between capitalists and workers centres largely around the question of wages and conditions of employment. The workers in the main are thus expending their energy in the struggle over hand to mouth conditions, and neglecting any study of the root causes of their poverty. The longer they pursue this short-sighted policy, which at the best can only slightly retard their downward progress into depths of poverty, the more permanent and fixed does the capitalist system

appear to them, and the more hopeless does their struggle seem.

It does not follow that their hopelessness will cause them to accept Socialism, which has to be understood first, and which therefore requires a certain amount of study. Until the workers are prepared to give the necessary time to its study the question of economic development is a secondary matter, and small progress is being made toward Socialism. Those who pretend that anything else but the propaganda of Socialist knowledge makes for Socialism are only spreading confusion among the workers and encouraging them in the belief that economic forces of themselves will work but their emancipation for them. Philip Snowden, writing in the "Labour Leader" (17.6.1920), is guilty of this kind of confusion. He says:

Disciples of Marx must be following with sympathy the frequent public appeals by Lever Brothers, Limited, for new capital. The function of the capitalists which Socialists can regard with approval is that of eliminating competition and concentrating capital into huge combines. If this process be a preliminary to Socialism, then no man of this generation is more entitled to the gratitude of Socialists than Lord Leverhulme. It is a pity that he is getting into advanced years, for if he could be spared to live and continue his activities for another generation, he would probably succeed in amalgamating all the commercial enterprises of the world. Then we should be ready for complete International Socialism.

The Socialist does not regard with approval the elimination of competition—that is only one of the contradictions of capitalism he calls attention to. Up to twenty years ago the economists all boasted that competition protected the consumer, while the economist of to-day tries to prove that the big concern—a result of the eliminating process—makes for economy in production and lower prices. It is no satisfaction to the Socialist that the development of capitalism causes greater suffering for the workers. Suffering alone does not make Socialists: it is more likely to result in desperate actions or futile attempts at reform, generally followed by apathy and inaction.

Mr. Snowden, after enumerating these items of economic development, says "Then we should be ready for complete International Socialism." But Socialism must be established by the working class, therefore, until the working class perceives in these economic factors the necessity for revolution and understand how to carry it through, we are not ready for Socialism. The economic factors wait on the knowledge of the workers. Without Socialist knowledge, no matter how these factors intensify, Socialism cannot be established. With Socialist knowledge the workers can take possession and control at any stage in capitalist development.

It is only the sentimental labour leader, always professing sympathy and friendship for the workers, that can see in their increasing poverty and hardship something to be thankful for, and can even express gratitude to the enemies of the workers for their callous methods. Thus Mr. Snowden says: "Men like Lord Leverhulme are undoubtedly instruments in the evolution of capitalism, and the services they have rendered in preparing the way for Socialism will probably be gratefully acknowledged, by the erection of marble monuments perhaps, by the Socialist Commonwealth." Such monuments would be incomplete without the effigies of labour leaders supporting the entablature, to signify their willingness to support them under capitalism.

But even while Mr. Snowden is lavishing praise on Lord Leverhulme and calling him comrade (extremely apt, by the way, as both are in one camp—the capitalist camp) Lord Leverhulme, in a dispute with his wage-slaves, beats them to their knees and forces them to accept his terms, thereby proving his antagonism to them and to the working class as a whole. In addition he cancels the co-partnership arrangement made with the strikers, who, thus find in that arrangement another weapon that can be used against them when they threaten to strike.

But the discovery by the workers that one reform is useless, or even harmful to them does not help them to see that all reforms are equally helpless to release them from the results of capitalist domination. Because one reform has failed them, they do not necessarily examine other reforms critically; on the contrary, they either swing back to the methods that captivated them before, or follow new will-o'-the-wisps invented by labour mis-leaders.

Profit-sharing was going to do wonderful things. Among others it was going to make the interests of capitalists and wage slaves identical. It did if the workers submitted—a chief condition of all capitalist experiments. The inevitable rupture having occurred, and Lever being the sole judge as to who is responsible for it—he being in possession—the workers lose their co-partnership holdings, and another bubble they have been chasing bursts, and leaves them wondering at their own childish credulity.

This has evidently convinced them, not that the interests of employers and employed are always opposed, but that "improvement in wages would have more permanent value to the whole of the workers." Thus they swing backwards and forwards like the pendulum, first putting their faith in the promises of their masters, and then just as blindly

AN UNUSUAL FRIENDSHIP.

(Continued from page 183.)

He had fully absorbed Lessing's statement that a perfect representation requires a fusion of image and conception, as closely joined as man and woman, and the university pedants have gotten square with him for this, from Father Wilhelm Roscher down to the youngest fledgling of a Privatdozent, by accusing him of being incapable of making himself understood except in an extremely vague way, "patched up with a liberal use of figurative language." Marx never exhausted the questions which he attacked beyond the point of enabling the reader to begin a fruitful train of thought; his speech is like the dancing of the waves over the purple depths of the sea.

Engels always saw in Marx a superior spirit; he never wished to play anything but second fiddle by his side. Yet he never was a mere interpreter and assistant, but always a collaborator of independent activity, a kindred spirit, though not of equal size. In the early days of their friendship, Engels played, in one important field, rather the role of a giver than of a receiver, and twenty years later Marx wrote to him: "You know that all ideas come to me too late, and that, in the second place, I always follow in your tracks." With his somewhat light equipment, Engels was able to move about more freely, and even though his glance was sharp enough to distinguish the decisive features of a question or of a situation, it did not penetrate far enough to review at once all the conditions and corollaries with which even the scantiest decision is often burdened. For a man of action this defect is even an advantage, and Marx never made a political decision without first calling upon Engels for advice, and Engels was usually able to hit the nail on the head.

Accordingly the advice which Marx asked from Engels was not as satisfactory in theory as in questions of politics. In theory Marx usually was the better of the two. And he was absolutely inattentive to such advice as Engels would often give him, in order to compel him to terminate his labors on his great scientific masterpiece. "Be a little less severe on yourself in the matter of your own productions; they are far too good for the public. The main thing is to have it finished and get it out; the defects that you still see the asses will never discover." It was a characteristic bit of Engels advice, and it was just as characteristic of Marx to ignore it.

It is clear from the above that Engels was better fitted for a journalistic career than Marx;

following the lead of labour confusionists. Every capitalist party deceives them in turn, and after each experiment, or reform, they find themselves no better off. With strikes, however, the workers have the satisfaction of knowing that they have at least put up a fight, tried to do something; but simply to wait on economic development, calling the capitalist "comrade" the while, is mere senseless optimism.

Economic conditions are ripe now for the establishment of Socialism, without any further amalgamation of capital or nationalisation of industries. The only thing now wanting is the acquisition of Socialist knowledge by the working class, and the organisation of the toilers for the accomplishment of their mission. The bigger the organisation spreading this knowledge, and the more rapidly and perfectly this other condition is achieved, the sooner shall we be ready. The obvious course for every worker, therefore, is to study Socialism, push Socialism, organise for Socialism.

F. F.

TRUTH WILL OUT.

In spite of the determined endeavours in capitalist circles to villify the Bolsheviks upon every possible occasion, there come times when the more responsible of them, driven into a corner, have to admit the truth. Such grudging admissions are not less impressive because they are wrung from hostile witnesses. Thus Mr. Bonar Law did much to demolish the structure of lies which his fellow capitalists have built up, with the aid of disgruntled parsons, dispossessed duchesses, and the prostitute Press, when he admitted in the House of Commons on August 9th, in reply to a question, that "British women and children in Baku have not been molested, and they have been allowed to look after their male relations in prison."

.

As we go to press the air is thick with rumours of war. The labour fakery are playing the same old game, promising to "reconsider the position" if the "independence" of Poland is violated. No wonder Lloyd George said "That is enough for me." Our readers know our position towards all capitalist wars. It is the Socialist position.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

"a real walking encyclopedia,"—so Marx once described him to a mutual friend—"capable of work at any hour of the day or night, drunk or sober, swift with his pen and alert as the devil." It seems that, both, after the cessation of the *Neue Rheinische Revue*, in the Autumn of 1850, had still in mind the issuing of another journal in common, to be printed in London; at least, in December, 1853, Marx wrote to Engels: "If we—you and I—had started our business as English correspondents in time, you would not now be condemned to office-work in Manchester nor I to my debts." Engels' choice of a position of clerk in his father's firm, in preference to the prospects of this "business" was probably due to his consideration for the hopeless situation of Marx, and to a hope of better times in the future, and certainly not with the object of devoting himself permanently to the "damned business." In the spring of 1854, Engels again considered the desirability of returning to London for literary work, but this was the last time; it must have been about this time that he made up his mind to assume the cursed burden for good, not merely in order to be of assistance to his friend, but in order thus to preserve the party's best mental asset. Only with this motivation could Engels make the great sacrifice, and Marx accept it: both the offer and the acceptance required a great spirit.

And before Engels became a partner in the firm some years later, he cannot exactly be said to have trod a path of roses, but from the first day of his stay at Manchester he aided Marx and never ceased aiding him. An unending stream of one-pound, five-pound, ten-pound, later even hundred-pound notes began to flow toward London. Engels never lost his patience, even though it was often sorely tried by Marx and his wife, who had no over-great supply of domestic wisdom. Slight was his concern when on the occasion of a general clean-up of the domestic economy, Mrs. Marx, through misplaced considerateness, concealed a large item and began paying it off by stinting with her household money, thus starting the old trouble over again, with the best of all intentions; on this occasion Engels allowed his friend the rather pharisaical amusement of bewailing the "idiocy of women," who manifestly are "in constant need of guardianship," and contented himself with the gentle admonition: See it doesn't happen again.

But Engels did not alone slave away for his friend in office and exchange all day long, but he also gave him most of his evening leisure hours, in fact, a great part of the night. Although the original reason for this added labor was the necessity of preparing an English

version of Marx's articles for the "New York Tribune," until Marx should be able to use the language well enough for literary purposes, the laborious co-operation continued for many years after the original reason had been overcome.

But all this seems a slight sacrifice compared with the greatest service which Engels rendered his friend, namely, his renunciation of his independent accomplishments as a thinker and investigator, which, in view of his incomparable energy and rich talents, would have produced valuable results. A correct notion of this sacrifice can also be obtained from the correspondence of the two men, even if we note only the studies in linguistic and military science, which were carried on by Engels partly owing to an "old predilection" and partly with a view to the practical needs of the struggle for proletarian emancipation. For, much as he hated all "autodidacticism,"—"its all damned nonsense," he contemptuously said—and thorough as were his methods of scientific work, he was yet as little a mere closet-scholar as Marx, and every new piece of knowledge was doubly precious in his eyes, if it might aid at once in lightening the chains of the proletariat.

He therefore undertook the study of the Slavic languages because of the "consideration" that in the next great clash of national interests "at least one of us" should be acquainted with the language, history, literature, social institutions of those nations with whom there was some likelihood of immediate conflict. Oriental troubles led him to the oriental languages; he steered clear of Arabic with its four thousand roots, but "Persian is a veritable child's play of a language"; he would be through with it in three weeks. Then came the turn of the Germanic languages: "I am now buried in Ulfilas: I simply had to get rid of this damned Gothic: I have been so long carrying it on in a rather desultory manner. I am surprised to find that I know much more than I expected. I need one more book, and then I'll be absolutely done with it in two weeks. And then for Old Norse and Old Saxon, with which I have long been on terms of half-acquaintance. As yet I have no paraphernalia, not even a lexicon: nothing but the Gothic text and old Grimm, but the old fellow is really a brick." In the sixties, when the Schleswig-Holstein question came up, Engels undertook "some Frisian-English-Jutian-Scandinavian philology and archaeology," and when the Irish question blazed up, "some Celto-Irish," and so on. In the General Council of the International his comprehensive linguistic accomplishments were of great value to him. "Engels can stammer in twenty languages,"

was said of him, because in moments of excitement he displayed a slight lisp.

Another epithet of his was that of the "General," which he earned by his still more assiduous devotion to the military sciences. Here also he was satisfying an "old predilection," at the same time that he was preparing for the practical needs of the revolutionary policy. Engels was counting on "the enormous importance which the *partie militaire* would attain in the next commotion." The experiences with the officers who had joined the revolution in the years of rebellion had not been very satisfactory, and Engels declared that "the military rabble has an incredibly dirty caste spirit. They hate each other worse than poison, envy each other like schoolboys at the slightest mark of distinction, but they show a united front against all civilians." Engels wanted to arrive at a point at which his theoretical remarks might have some weight and might not merely expose his ignorance.

He had hardly gotten established in Manchester when he began to "plug up military science." He began with the "simplest and most rudimentary things, such as are asked in an ensign's or lieutenant's examination, and are therefore assumed by all authors as already known." He studied everything about army administration, down to the most technical details: Elementary tactics, Vauban's system of fortification, and all other systems, including the modern system of detached forts, bridge construction and fieldworks, fighting tools, down to the varying construction of carriages for field-guns, the ravitaillement of hospitals, and other matters; finally he passed on to the general history of war, in which connection he paid particular attention to the English authority Napier, the French Jomini, and the German Clausewitz.

Far removed from any shallow attacks on the moral folly of warfare, Engels sought rather to recognise its historic justification, by which effort he more than once aroused the violent rage of declamatory democracy. Byron once poured the phials of his scorching rage over the two generals who, at the Battle of Waterloo, in the character of champions of feudal Europe, inflicted a death-blow on the heir of the Revolution; it was an interesting accident that made Engels, in his letters to Marx, outline historic portraits both of Wellington and Blücher, which in their small compass, are so complete and so distinct that they hardly need to be altered in a single respect to make them fully acceptable to the the present state of advancement of military science.

In a third field, too, in which Engels also labored much and with pleasure, namely, that

of the natural sciences, he was not to have the opportunity during the decades of his bondage to commence in order to afford free rein to the scientific investigations of another man—to put the finishing touches to his own labors.

And this was really a tragic lot. But Engels never wailed about it, for sentimentality was as foreign to his nature as to his friend's. He always held it to be the great good fortune of his life to have stood by Marx's side for forty years, even at the price of being completely overshadowed by Marx's gigantic form. Nor did he consider it a belated form of satisfaction to be permitted, after the death of his friend, to be the first man of the international workers' movement, to play the first violin, as it were, undisputed, in this movement; on the contrary he considered this to be an honour that was too great for his merits.

As each of the two men was completely absorbed in the common cause, and each man made an equally great sacrifice to it, although not an identical sacrifice, without any disagreeable reservation of objection or of boast, their friendship became an alliance which has no parallel in human history.

(FRANZ MEHRING in "The Class Struggle," May, 1919.)

YOU CAN HELP.

One or more capitalist groups or individuals have been busy of late issuing pamphlets and leaflets pretending to combat Socialism. Lord Leverhulme's pamphlet "What is Capital" is a case in point. These lucubrations bear the name of no organisation or individual as the issuer, hence it is difficult to find out who the responsible parties are. In all cases that have come before our notice the effort at capitalist propaganda is so comically poor that there is no wonder no one can be found to publicly fether the miserable weakling. It seems, however, that many large employers are thinking it worth their while to get these leaflets circulated, more or less surreptitiously, among their workpeople.

This, of course, is sufficient reason for us to find out just what is going on, and we shall be glad if friends who are fortunate (!) enough to share in these generous gifts from their masters would forward them to the Editorial Committee of the SOCIALIST STANDARD, at the Head Office of the Party, giving fullest particulars as to how they came by them.

We would point out to our friends that there can hardly be any finer antidote to this sneaky capitalist propaganda than our Manifesto, of which we have just issued the Sixth Edition.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Mattheu-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 174 Murdock-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham. Branch meets Sat. at Coffee House, Spicel-st.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Comtee Applications to General Secy.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and last Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142 Bulwar-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., 70 Newcastle-st., Hulme, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Exmouth-St. Schools (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High-rd., Willesden-green, N.W.10.

SOUTHEAST-ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Secy., 207 Derinton-rd., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets Fridays at 143 Beechcroft-rd., Upper Tooting at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Secy., C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 51 Greenleaf-rd., Walthamstow. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday. Visitors invited.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 11.30 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.
Manor Park, "Earl of Essex," 7 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.

Fridays:

Battersea, "Prince's Head," 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 193. Vol. 17.]

LONDON, SEPT., 1920.

[MONTHLY, TWO PENCE

CHEAP AT THE PRICE.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

An M.A. Speaks his Mind.

Someone has just estimated that we are spending no less than £150,000,000 a year on education. . . . Education tends to become more and more standardised. The same set of subjects is taught to each class of boys and girls, in town and in country, quite irrespective of what is to be their ultimate occupation. . . . The boy who is going to devote himself to the pursuit of agriculture, equally with one who is going to work at a skilled trade in a town, is crammed at school with a number of subjects which have no bearing whatever on his future career. . . . We simply cannot afford to increase our already crushing load of taxation by laying out money upon schemes that may be very interesting, unless we can feel that they are going to result in getting the world's work done.

The above is from an article by D. Kennedy-Bell, M.A., B.D., which appeared in the "Sunday Pictorial" of July 11th. It is interesting because it openly avows the object of education to be to get "the world's work done." The writer strongly objects to expenditure on education that does not make for efficiency. The aim of education must be greater production, and the method advocated is to separate students according to their abilities and educate them for the occupations for which they are physically or mentally adapted.

His Logic Admitted.

No one can fall out with this reasoning. If the sole object of education is to fit the young for the business of wealth production, and that business calls for workers with different forms of skill, then, obviously, a specialised education for each calling will be both economical in itself and produce the most efficient and economical workers.

But is the "getting of work done" the sole object of education? Viewed in this way, expenditure on education is like the Scriptural bread thrown on the waters to be returned a

hundredfold. Returned to who? Most big capitalist concerns have well-equipped laboratories where research is carried on, and where young men are trained to carry on this work, because it results in discoveries that simplify processes and still further increase profits for the shareholders. In this narrow sphere it is not difficult to see that it is the shareholders who reap the full benefits, while the workers get nothing beyond wages based on the cost of living and a growing fear of unemployment as a result of their own increased powers of production.

The Question is Confused.

When it is a question of national expenditure on education, however, it is not so easy to see who are the actual gainers. The whole question is confused by the false, but prevailing, notion that all the members of society share in the State expenditure according to their means and reap the benefits according to their ability or perseverance.

To get behind this curtain of prejudice we must examine the educational system in conjunction with the industrial system, when we shall, perhaps, discover, not only that it is a prejudice, but also that Mr. Kennedy-Bell has failed to appreciate the cunning with which the modern system of education has been devised to satisfy the requirements of modern industrialism. For the bulk of the population education finishes with the board school at fourteen years of age—an age barely sufficient to appreciate its value. Mr. Kennedy-Bell complains that a number of subjects are taught, but he does not say how little is taught of each subject. The board school education is scrappy and disconnected; its most advanced subjects are those of the counting house. Natural science is barely touched upon, instead, the

(robber) captains of industry are held up as examples of greatness, their success, it is said, being due to perseverance, ability, and all the other qualities the factory worker must possess in order to get a living as a wage-slave.

What Capitalism Needs.

Poor as the board school education is, however, it is ample for the mass of the workers, whose tasks in the modern factory are, in the main, purely mechanical, and can be learned in a few days or even hours.

Capitalist industry, however, requires a certain proportion of workers who must be equipped with a specialised knowledge in a number of different spheres. For this purpose there are in existence higher grade schools and technical institutes, some State-owned and others privately owned, that provide for capitalist requirements by the promise of better paid jobs; though in the long run the increasing numbers who struggle for these jobs defeat their object by overstepping the demand. This is by the way, however, and in any case the capitalists get a supply of all the different kinds of labour in excess of their requirements. This, of course, generally speaking, because there are times when, for short periods, and in particular occupations, the supply may be barely adequate.

"Our educational system" is peculiarly adapted to the requirements of the industrial system. It provides for the capitalists huge numbers of workers with just enough education to work intelligently at menial and degrading tasks, yet not so much as will enable them to see the degradation—part of their education being that they are under the stern necessity of working, and they can only escape hard work by working harder, like their masters.

The Capitalists Spoil It.

The system also provides in adequate numbers all the better-equipped workers necessary to them; if it is not so perfect as it might be it is not because of lack of desire on the part of the capitalists, but is due to mismanagement, or to conflicting interests between capitalists themselves who use their political influence to establish education on a basis more in harmony with their sectional requirements.

Of course this hypothesis assumes that the capitalist class have complete control over the educational authorities, which is perfectly true. Society is saturated with capitalist ideas and opinions by means of the Press. Religion, art, and science are harnessed to the car of industry and serve the interests of the ruling class, either by cheapening the processes of production or assisting them to maintain their dominant position. Soaked with capitalist prejudices

and fallacies, even labour leaders, professing, and sometimes believing in, their ability to do something for the workers, and striving to do their best for working-class education on local administrative bodies, are powerless to alter the general trend of the forces that make education for the working class an accessory to capitalist production and nothing more.

Thus the great mass of the workers are shut out from the vast realm of knowledge inherited from the past. Only the sons and daughters of the wealthy have the time and opportunity to acquire knowledge, for the sole reason that it makes life richer. The sons and daughters of the miner and the factory hand are crammed for nine or ten years with a so called useful education, and flung on the labour market while still children, to pile up wealth for the master class.

Who Foots the Bill.

To return to Mr. Kennedy-Bell, his complaint is that "we do not get value for the £150,000,000 we spend on education. The real significance of this complaint is at once seen now that we know where the money comes from. The wages received by the workers, based on the cost of living, and rising and falling as the cost of living rises and falls, cannot be tapped to pay the cost of education. The capitalist class must, therefore, pay for education. They must pay for it out of profits. And as they control the political and administrative machinery of the State, they can adjust educational expenditure according to their industrial needs.

It is obvious to the capitalists, if it is not to the workers, that the State, which enables them to effect the robbery, must be maintained by them jointly, and a little thought will show that the capitalist class pays, not only for education, but for all the other institutions and forces that help to preserve society in its present form.

The industrial system gives the capitalist class all the wealth of society. Education gives them a working class saturated with their beliefs and ideas, and political propaganda gives them control of the political and administrative machinery of the State.

The Fly in the Ointment.

Thus they have the power, through the forces they control, to continue their robbery of the working class, to arrange education according to their industrial needs, and to falsely educate the workers in fallacies and superstitions that have long since been exploded by science. The secret of capitalist power is, therefore, control of the political machine, and the capitalist class spend vast sums on maintaining their control. The only fly in the ointment on their side is

that they cannot keep it a secret, and when once it becomes generally realised by the workers, together with a knowledge of their slave position, the capitalist system will be nearing its abolition.

With the establishment of a sane system of society education will no longer be a mere adjunct of the industrial process, carried on for the benefit of a small class. Its character and scope will be determined by the people themselves. And whether it is chiefly concerned with the production of wealth or not, it must always be of vital interest to everyone, because it will constitute the mental equipment of all the members of society, freely associating on terms of equality in the ownership and administration of the means of wealth production. Every new discovery, under such a system, will mean new enjoyments or more leisure, which can be used up in recreation or the pursuit of further knowledge.

F. F.

DON'T BE FUTILE.

In the latter days of last July, a body of people calling themselves The No-Conscription Fellowship, appointed a committee to organise the "Widest Possible Resistance" by people who objected to rendering war service against Russia.

That committee drafted a manifesto calling upon those who objected to performing military service against Russia, or making and transporting munitions, or who would resist all military preparations and the imposition of conscription, to forward their names with the object of strengthening their resistance by being formed into an organised body.

The committee were, according to themselves, "overwhelmed with replies, a very large proportion of them from ex-service men who are most vigorous in their expression of determination not to fight in the new war should it come."

We must class both leaders and supporters of such a movement as being illogical, short-sighted, and utterly void of understanding of the conditions which govern them, which, of course, connotes the fact that they do not know the cause of their condition.

We claim to know the cause of this condition.

We know that, as the effect of that cause, wars are inevitable. We know that, as a result of their condition, the workers generally are not in a position to resist conscription.

We know the cause of the general poverty, want, and degradation, the insecurity of life, that is the lot of the workers.

When we speak of workers we do not differentiate between nigger drivers, quill drivers,

'bus drivers, and cattle drivers. Whether you are a manager, clerk, navvy, or soldier matters not. If you sell your services in order that you may live, you are a worker; your services are sold to an employer in precisely the same way as a pound of cheese is sold over the counter, and that very fact abolishes the consideration of "classes" among the workers. There is another "class," we grant—the non-workers or capitalists; the employing class; the people who own the means of life.

We do not differentiate between capitalists, either. It is immaterial to us whether a capitalist drops his aitches, came over with William the Conk, gets his money from a pickle factory, or has blue blood in his veins. We are only concerned with the fact that the capitalists have appropriated to themselves the means of life over the whole of the earth.

And it is the workers, who are in the vast majority, who have GIVEN THEM THE OPPORTUNITY of appropriating the earth.

It is the workers who, in their abysmal ignorance, continually keep on giving away their chances of recovering that ownership of the earth, who continually place in the hands of the capitalists and their agents fresh accretions of power.

Capitalism is the name of the system under which we are living now.

It is a system in which the only place for the workers (who, after all, are the only USEFUL human beings on earth) is at the bottom. That is their right place in such a system, AND THE WORKERS MUST LIKE IT, or they would never put up with it.

We know differently, though. We know that the things which prevent the workers from regaining the power of enjoying to the full all that the earth and their own capabilities could give them are pitifully profound ignorance and deadly apathy.

The capitalists and their agents who compose our governments know only too well that where numbers are concerned they are nowhere against the workers and so by subtlety, cunning, and absolute unscrupulousness they lead the workers by the nose and get them to give them power, and with that power make the workers do all that the capitalists require of them.

Everything that is done in the world to-day, from managing a mine to sweeping a road, is done by the worker. The capitalist does nothing useful, yet he enjoys the best of everything.

To protect the property of the capitalists and to gain fresh property for them, their agents (whom the workers elect to Parliament) have the power to send fighting forces to any part of the world, and also have the power, incredible

as it may seem, to gull the worker into believing that it is being done for his benefit.

If the standing army is insufficient, the agents of the capitalists bring in "conscription."

Some few of the workers decided to stand out of the last great war our masters had. As a consequence of the SYSTEM that the majority of them had never dreamed of abolishing, they had a hell of a time—and some died.

Now we have the No-Conscription Fellowship advocating that the workers should ask for more trouble. What they are actually doing is leading the workers from the only path that will finally lead to the abolition of wars.

The doings of the armed forces of government are, in the final analysis, ordered by the majority of the members of Parliament, who, we have pointed out are capitalist agents.

While the workers keep voting "So-and-So candidate" into Parliament without having studied the matter at all, M.P.s will continue to be agents of the master class. That being the case, how can the workers expect that government will be in the interest of the workers?

The government of the workers in the interest of the capitalist class will go on just the same, and when the next great war comes the conscientious objectors will again fill vacancies in H.M. goals or special settlements.

Your condition when the next great war comes will be precisely the same as it was when the last war came, whether you join the No-Conscription Fellowship or not.

The cure for the evils suffered by the workers under the present system is—SOCIALISM.

Don't be afraid of the word, as your grandmother taught you to be.

Don't put your thinking out for a man on a platform to do for you—do it yourself.

CAPITALISM, a system of private ownership and control of the things necessary for you to live by, leaves you, the actual producer of all that is useful in the world, at the bottom of things—never sure of to-morrow's food, without any security of right to live.

SOCIALISM, a system of common ownership and control of the means of life, would put you on your proper plane in life, without a "superior," still an actual worker, sure of food, clothing, shelter, and the very minimum of hours of labour.

When the means of life are commonly owned, do you think for a moment that you will fight each other for oil wells, or for wheat fields, or for anything else?

In the words of Bernard Shaw's puppet, NOT SO BLOODY LIKELY!

Get acquainted with the Socialist Party of Great Britain, the only party in this country expounding Socialism.

SELIM.

THE WITCHES' CAULDRON

"The International Financial Conference, which has been called by the League of Nations, is now fixed to take place in Brussels on Sept. 24th. All members of the League have been invited to send delegations, and all but a few have accepted. Invitations have also been sent to ex-enemy countries."—*Star*, Aug. 31.

I wonder what is in the wind?

Has the League of Nations (which the ordinary worker was led to believe was formed to prevent wars) got so far on the road to the preservation of peace as to have discovered that financial interests are the cause of all modern wars?

Is it going to preach "brotherly love" to those attending?

Is it going to plead with them to improve the conditions of the poor all over the world?

Is it going to show those financiers a royal road to reduced armaments?

Will it concern itself about alleviating the distress of the poor dupes who suffered in and because of the last great war for markets?

According to what we have been told by Mr. Horatio Bottomley and a few more of the kidney who make a fat living out of doing the workers' thinking for them, the League of Nations was half dead when born and sure of being quite dead very shortly.

Yet it appears that the League of Nations is such a vigorous and healthy thing that it can call together our capitalist masters for a Conference!

"It is clear from the personnel of the delegations that the Conference is to be of an authoritative kind. In many cases Ministers of Finance will represent their countries."—Same capitalist rag continued.

One can hardly imagine "Ministers of Finance" "representing their countries" for the benefit of the workers of those countries, although those workers have been taught that it is their country.

"In other countries, as, for instance, in the case of Great Britain, a delegation has been appointed composed of 'experts' calculated to represent the different aspects of British finance, one being a late head of the Treasury, another a Governor of the Bank of England, and a third the head of one of the great joint stock banks."—As before.

Whatever has a conference of financiers to do with ensuring peace throughout the world?

AS SOCIALISTS, understanding the system we live under, we say—EVERYTHING! The

peace you will get through the League of Nations is only the peace of death.

In all probability the venue of the next great war will be decided at that conference.

We Socialists, who know that peace is only a concern of those "pawns on the chessboard," the workers of the world, would rather believe that the conference will decide on how to restore Russia—to the grip of the capitalists completely.

No doubt the methods employed to do so will include a "kindly" desire to see a "settled and constitutional form of democratic Government in Russia."

Russia has oil.

Russia has enormous wheat-growing areas.

Russia contains enormous natural reserves of wealth.

AND THE HAND OF THE CAPITALIST ITCHES TO GET AT IT!!!

SELIM.

PERSONALITY.

The Socialist has great difficulty in propagating the principles of Socialism, inasmuch as the mass of the people look at political and economic affairs from a personal point of view.

Evidence of that is obvious enough when the people take part in a general election. The general election of December 14th 1918 was acclaimed as a victory for Mr. Lloyd George—and so it was.

The workers, or at least the majority of them, wanted Mr. Lloyd George to be Prime Minister, and their will prevailed. Mr. Lloyd George and his Coalition party went into Government with flying colours—and the workers' choice of persons was settled.

Strange to say, the workers' action on the industrial field has been a complete contradiction of their hopes and expectations. Their "good men" have missed fire. The workers thought that so and so would try to improve working-class conditions. There are thousands of men and women unemployed, and the increased cost of living makes the unemployed workers more dangerous and worrying, more anxious and poverty-stricken. Mr. Lloyd George and his party are in power, but are powerless to improve the position of the working class.

Strikes took place soon after the General Election and have continued up to the present. Mr. Lloyd George was not asked if he approved of the workers striking. Why not? Mr. Lloyd George was sent to Parliament to govern the country. Why were the workers so fickle-minded? One would have expected such a "great man" to be consulted. Strikes make it rather awkward for the right honourable gen-

tleman. The workers keep him busy organising schemes to beat the strike, when he might be playing golf or composing a speech about downing the Lords and giving heroes a chance to have a lick at a decent life.

In spite of it all—the winning of the war, the winning of the railway strike, the winning of votes from the working class—Mr. Lloyd George has nothing to give you but promises. Why? Because the right honourable gent upholds the capitalist principles of private ownership and the consequent exploitation of the workers to enrich the owners of the means and instruments of wealth production. He has promised to make this country fit for heroes to live in!

The Socialists expect no more than that, because we know that personality has never yet improved the workers' life. There is something greater than personality, and that is principle.

Principle is defined in a dictionary as "fundamental truth, original cause, motive, rule." The system under which we live is dominated by the capitalist class, and consequently is and must be run on capitalist principles.

Wealth, which includes margarine, dud food, dud drink, dud clothing, dud houses, and perhaps in the near future monkeys' glands, is produced fundamentally for profit, and not as a rule for use. The motive of the capitalist class is to get as much wealth as possible with as little expense as can be in the producing of the same. Therefore it is not strange that the workers are poor in the midst of plenty.

Capitalist production and distribution make the worker strike and in other ways show his discontent. Personality is best suited for the capitalist class, for their system is established and in working order. For them a choice of persons is quite correct. Whether Mr. Lloyd George or some other person shall be at the head of their administration is logical from a capitalist point of view. The working class are not organised for the establishment of a system suitable for them. So, when they are voting for a Person they are not minding their own business. The persons whom the working class vote for must work for capitalist interests, for the simple reason that the workers are not against the capitalist system. Their votes are for or against a Person or Persons, with the idea that some are for working-class improvement and others against.

A remarkable example of a minority of persons who have usurped political power is to be seen to-day in Russia. There you have a body of men and women who determined to establish society on communistic principles. It has turned out to be a failure, because the majority of the people were not mentally fit for a system

of common ownership, and because the economic conditions were not ripe. The Bolsheviks were compelled to compromise with the capitalist class, who own and control the world's means of production and distribution.

Therefore as long as the majority of the world's workers are not prepared and organised to institute the Socialist Commonwealth, they will have to suffer poverty in the midst of plenty, wholesale slaughter, and a future black with the hovering clouds of war and unemployment, strikes and so forth.

In spite of sending "jolly good fellows" to Parliament this chaos must ensue, and the workers only exhibit their ignorance of political and economic affairs in so doing.

Thorold Rogers in his book "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," tells us (p. 398) "What a husbandman earned with 15 weeks work in 1495, a whole year's labour would not supply artisan or labourer with in the year 1725 throughout Lancashire. I have protested before against the complacent optimism which concludes, because the health of the upper classes has been bettered, and appliances, unknown before, have become familiar and cheap, that therefore the country in which these improvements have been effected must be considered to have made, for all its people, regular and continuous progress. I contend that from 1653 to 1824, a conspiracy, concocted by the law and carried out by parties interested in its success, was entered into, to cheat the English workman of his wages, to tie him to the soil, to deprive him of hope, and to degrade him into irremediable poverty."

Many "great men" since 1824 have been elected to Parliament—with great enthusiasm. Yet to day the workers are worse off than in 1495, and for a very good reason. The masters have reaped all the benefit of the vast strides made in the improvement of the instruments of labour, and have even succeeded in turning the very fertility of his labour against the wage labourer.

And to-morrow, if a so-called Labour Government were elected, capitalist interests would prevail, because the workers are not organised for common ownership.

Salvation from poverty in the midst of plenty cannot be obtained by voting for Persons. The only way is to organise and vote for the principle of the common ownership of the means and instruments of wealth production.

Until the time of working-class enlightenment and consequent control of our lives and destiny, we must suffer the evils of private ownership and "great men" with tongues of promise.

S. W.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF SOCIALIST THEORY.

(Continued.)

In the last article we pointed out that the modern class struggle has been fought out for years in a vague sort of way. The bulk of those who took part in it aimed merely at higher wages and improved conditions of labour, but, in spite of their activities in the struggle, there has been a steady downward tendency in the life conditions of the workers. In other words the workers have steadily lost ground in the fight.

Poverty is more wide-spread now than formerly: the dividing line between capitalist and wage-worker is more clearly defined; the former class is narrowing while the latter is broadening; and finally there is almost as much chance now-a-days for a worker to push his way into the ranks of the capitalists as there is for the biblical camel to get through the eye of the biblical needle. Even the status of the self-styled Intellectuals (technical experts, managers, writers, and so on) is declining and they are becoming as plentiful as potatoes—and commanding a corresponding price.

In spite of continual defeats, however, the economic struggle over working conditions has been fruitful. It is steadily driving the mass of the workers nearer and nearer to recognising that the way out of their troubles lies in abolishing the cause of wage slavery instead of tinkering with effects; and that way lies on the political field in the struggle for the possession of political power.

From the point of view of fighting economically the workers possess no power except that of causing temporary dislocation of production. Any dislocation in production that lasted long enough to be serious would compel the workers to succumb first as they would feel the pinch first and most acutely. They only way they could win would be to carry the matter to its uttermost extremity by starving to death—committing suicide.

The long history of trade union activity is accompanied by the history of the steady worsening of the lot of the worker. This does not mean that the worker should abandon the fight to sell his labour-power to the best advantage. As Marx has so clearly demonstrated in "Value, Price and Profit," such inaction would be suicidal. The tendency of capitalism is to reduce the worker to the state of a coolie, and though, in the economic struggle, this downward tendency cannot be prevented, the speed of the process is retarded—the standard of living is

lowered less rapidly. Above all, the worker who is not prepared to fight for the best bread and margarine he can obtain makes poor material to fight for Socialism.

As the workers get nearer to a knowledge of their position they recognise more clearly the extent and the limitations of economic action, and consequently wage this part of the struggle more effectively.

To understand the class struggle it is necessary to distinguish clearly between the two forms in which it is manifested: the narrow, limited (though necessary) fight about the conditions under which labour-power is sold, and the revolutionary political fight for the abolition of the wages system.

All historical classes that have attained social supremacy (including the Bolsheviks) have done so by virtue of the fact that they have obtained control of the political power at the disposal of society.

In the past, before the State power had undergone the development that made it such an admirable repressive weapon, it was essential for the would-be dominant class to obtain possession of the political power before such class could become the ruling class. Now that the State has reached such perfection it is even more essential than ever to obtain control of the powers of government.

In his study of the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War entitled "The Civil War in France," Marx gives a picture of the development of the State since the revolutions that raised the capitalists to power. The following from this description is illuminating:

"At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened, intensified the class-antagonism between capital and labour, the State power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labour, of a public force organised for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism. After every revolution marking a progressive phase in the class struggle, the purely repressive character of of the State power stands out in bolder and bolder relief." (P. 40, Kerr edition.)

This State power (represented by the army, police, judicial machinery, etc.), now in the hands of the employing class, is used to crush any attempts on the part of the workers to secure better conditions by means of violence, and also to bring the easy-going natives in non-developed countries abroad within the pale of wage-slavery. It is the power that renders futile any attempt of the workers to disrupt present society or obtain any radical alteration in their conditions unless, as a preliminary

step, they obtain control of it. So long as this power is monopolised by the master class they hold the key to the position, and can keep the chains of wage slavery firmly riveted on the workers.

Hence the revolutionary side of the workers' activities must take the line of removing this repressive power from the hands of the masters. The means to accomplish this end lie to hand.

Unfortunately for our rulers, as they become further and further removed from active participation in productive operations, abdicating from one after another of their useful functions and cultivating an inveterate idleness, so they become less and less able to keep their society in working order without conceding a greater and greater measure of participation in political action to the workers. As capitalist society became more complicated and unwieldy, the capitalist class had to ascertain the social needs by conceding to the mass of society a greater opportunity to express itself. But this was, at the same time, digging the grave of capitalism. The franchise was not extended to the workers merely because they struggled for it; in reality the capitalists needed the aid of the workers to save their system from chaos.

To-day the State power is controlled directly by and through Parliament. Parliamentary candidates are elected and the workers form the great majority of the electors. Consequently when they wish to do so they can obtain control of the state power by sending delegates to Parliament for that specific purpose.

Apropos of Lenin and his would-be imitators it is well to note that the workers could not "smash up" the State without first obtaining control of it. Guns can't be smashed with bladders of wind!

The line of action to be taken by the workers in the struggle for emancipation is to organise for the purpose of conquering political power. In this struggle it must be borne in mind that, as the aim of the working-class party is directly antagonistic to capitalism, no help (except what is given unintentionally) will be forthcoming from the enemy—the capitalists. Consequently the working-class party must avoid compromise and political bargains as it would the plague. It must be a revolutionary, and not a reform, party.

To take part in compromise is to admit that there is a common standing ground between the opposing hosts, in other words, that capitalists can go some of the way with us. Capitalism, however, has reached its highest point of progress in the development of the productive powers to their present extraordinary pitch. It

Continued on next page.

OFFICIAL NOTICE

OFFICIAL NOTICE.
All communications for the Executive Committee, subscriptions to the **SOCIALIST STANDARD**, articles, and correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed,—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.—to whom Money Orders should be made payable.
The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office every Tuesday at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free ...	2s. 6d.
Six " " " ...	1s. 3d.

The Socialist Standard.



WED.

SEP. 1, 1920.

WHAT THE STRIKE FEVER POINTS TO.

The anxieties and troubles of "peace" seem to be only less wearing than those of war. But a couple of decades ago the biggest of strikes was chiefly the concern of those directly connected with the struggle, and had little effect outside their small circle. The greatest of them—the great London Dock Strike—bitter and prolonged as it was, hardly affected the everyday life of the mass of the people even of London—much less of the country—at all.

In this respect, however, things are changing very rapidly. A year or so ago the Railway strike threatened to plunge to the country into the agony of acute industrial warfare; to-day the threatened coal strike menaces our very lives—for there can be no doubt that many workers' lives must pay the penalty of a stoppage of mining operations of even a few days' duration.

As the field and extent of these ghastly, even if necessary, operations, develops, and their disastrous consequences take a wider and more deadly embrace, it surely should be borne in upon all workers how futile it all really is, and urge them to consider the solution proffered them by the Socialists. The private ownership of the means of production threatens society, in "peace" and in war, with disruption so violent as to overwhelm it in chaos.

Surely it must be apparent that the task which inexorably faces the working class is the overthrow of private ownership and the establishment of common ownership in the means of living.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF SOCIALIST THEORY.

(Continued from page 7.)

has now become a fetter upon production and is in the crumbling stage as the growing misery of the mass of the population testify. It has ceased to be revolutionary and is now reactionary. This point will be developed further in another part of this investigation.

A party that advocates reforms leads the workers, in the first place, to waste time and energy chasing shadows, and, in the second place, to place reliance upon, and power in the hands of one or other leading personality interested either in some particular type of reform or in feathering his nest.

The only method of fighting the class struggle politically with any hope of success is to aim straight at the control of political power for the purpose of ushering in Socialism, organising solely for that purpose, avoiding all blind alleys and compromises, no matter in what fine raiment of glowing phraseology they may be clothed. "Compromise is virtual death." "Expediency" happy word! has been used from early days to cover the blackest acts of treachery and trickery recorded in history, and is the corner stone of the parties of so-called "practical politicians" who are fishing for working-class support at the present time.

In the political arena at the present day there moves an individual who owes his position to a political bargain around which much discussion rages a number of years ago. We refer to M. Millerand, the French Premier and very useful tool of the French capitalists. His entrance into a capitalist government (where he sat as an "honourable friend" beside Gallifet, the butcher of the Communards) was greeted as a great victory by the Labour Movement of the time. His subsequent activities have illustrated how hollow are the "victories" obtained by compromise.

To sum up, the class struggle between the working class and the capitalist class intensifies year by year. Its only solution lies in the political victory of the working class, the overthrow of the foundations of existing society and the introduction of Socialism. This victory can only be secured by the workers understanding their class position and organising into an uncompromising, class-conscious political organisation for the purpose of taking out of the hands of the capitalists the power with which they hold the mass of society in subjection.

GILMAC.

TO BE CONTINUED.

THE POSITION IN JAPAN.

The "Daily News" of July 10th included an article by A.G.G., the gist of which was a plaintive appeal against the renewal of the Treaty of 1902 between Japan and England, and in the course of his screed the writer accuses Japan of using the peculiar conditions brought about by the outbreak of the great war to her own advantage, implying in addition the use of her natural proximity to China to the disadvantage of that country, keeping in mind the fact that the remainder of the Allies had their hands too full in Europe to exercise any sort of control over her actions.

It is not intended here to go into the question as to whether possible acquisitions in China were a part of the bribe held out to Japan in order to secure her adhesion to the Allied cause; although the Versailles Peace Treaty has made it reasonably clear that all the smaller nations who were induced to participate in the conflict had certain concrete inducements offered to them as a *quid pro quo*.

In passing, a scrutiny of this Peace Treaty will also show that the bribes that were offered were all at the expense of the smaller nations for whom "we" affected to be so much concerned. Further in this connection, it might be suggested that offering the property of others is a very cheap form of bribery, as it leaves in the balance the question of being able to fulfil the obligation, and when it is fulfilled of course it has the additional beauty of being expensive only to the bespoiled party.

It may not be generally known that the Treaty of Alliance of 1902 between England and Japan had as its specific objective the maintenance of the integrity of the Chinese Empire in the following terms (as quoted by "A.G.G."):

What are its objects? They are three:

- (1) The maintenance of the general peace in the regions of Eastern Asia and of India ;
- (2) The preservation of the common interests of all Powers in China by insuring the independence and integrity of the Chinese Empire, and the principle of equal opportunities for the commerce and industry of all nations in China ;
- (3) The maintenance of the territorial rights of the High Contracting Parties, and the defence of their special interests in Eastern Asia and India.

These terms can be called safe, seeing that they provide for the "preservation" of the common interests of all powers, and the "principle of equal opportunities for the commerce and industry of all nations in China." This form of phrase is typical of all treaties between great Powers wherein the superficial assumption would be concern for the lesser Power in

that the interests are always open to be enforced, so that the blatant hypocrisy of the whole business is always likely to be shown.

In the camp of the "High Contracting Parties" all is peace until such time as one begins to think that the other or others are getting too large a share of the loot, or so long as each is satisfied that it cannot do better by itself. But when this state of things becomes disrupted the trouble begins, and we find our gallant champions of the smaller nations are simply brigands out on the grab.

"A.G.G." accuses Japan of having grabbed more than she should, and wishes US, you and me, fellow worker, to give the year's notice required for the termination of the Alliance.

There is not much that can be said about the Japanese politician and diplomat that cannot be said about those of any other nation. They are doing the bidding of the Japanese section of the capitalist class in the same way that the politicians and diplomats of other nations are accomplishing the purposes of their capitalist masters, and the impulse behind it all is not regard for the rights of small nations, or respect for treaties.

What they prate of as "justice" is merely their idea of what will best further their efforts in the struggle for the world's markets. This struggle, it is now clear to all intelligent people, precipitated the ghastly war through which we have just passed.

The writer of this article had occasion to take up a temporary residence in Japan recently, and during his stay had reason to travel up and down the country very extensively. He found all those social phenomena which are to be found here just as obvious there applying both to the workers and the masters. The struggle for existence is pretty well as keen there as here, the qualifying term being used advisedly owing to the fact that the Japanese master class have not quite rid themselves of the old patriarchal idea—there is still a glimmering of the principle behind Japanese industry that the worker is a responsibility of the master and as such the attitude does not appear to be quite so ruthless as it does in countries in which capitalism is not of recent development.

For instance, one will often find very old men working in some of the largest and most up-to-date plants in the country; these men are looked upon largely in the light of pensioners, and when they are unable to muster the requisite energy to crawl to their daily toil some small pension is generally allotted to them so that they do not have to fall back upon the charity of their relatives. As a matter of fact, as there is no such thing in Japan as a workhouse or parochial Union, it will be understood that the

Japanese worker, without some support from the master for whom he has spent his life's blood, would be compelled to fall back upon the charity of his friends and relatives because no other resource would be open to him.

As a further illustration of this point it may be said that the beggars which abound in the land of the rising sun are all diseased or blind and are brought up from infancy to begging as a profession. No attempt is made by the Japanese Government to control the beggars as such. They have merely to conform to the ordinary law which applies to all workers, and they have their own union. The difference which strikes one between the beggars of this and other Western capitalist countries and those of Japan is that the former are nearly always industrial "throw-outs" while the latter seldom are.

It is very difficult indeed to get a true perspective of Japanese working-class life beyond the knowledge that the basis is the same as in all other capitalist countries, owing to the impossibility of reading the Japanese printed matter. It is comparatively easy to gain a smattering of the colloquial tongue, but this only enables one to find one's way about, as it were, and does not open up the possibility of entering into detailed exchange of opinions. The fact that the literature is inaccessible is due to the fact that a lifetime of study would be necessary to gain a reading knowledge of the language. Therefore the only resource of the European who wishes to examine Japanese conditions through literature is the European Press of the country, which from day to day publishes extracts from the native Press. It can be readily understood what point of view is presented in these extracts, and what value, consequently, is to be credited to the information to be culled from such source.

There are, of course, many Japanese who speak English, but these, amongst the workers, are more or less what would be termed "middle class," and one gets from them very much the same views as from their prototype here.

Among the workers the iron of capitalism is biting deeper and ever deeper. Rice, the staple food of the whole nation, has risen in price by more than 400 per cent. during the last two years, and although wages have risen in practically the same degree, helped by the favourable position that Japan has occupied during the war, now that other countries are entering into competition with her this favourable condition of things will necessarily be modified, and is already making the struggle for existence show itself in a more marked degree.

The signs of unrest are becoming increasingly evident, and a constant succession of strikes,

with a growing membership of the labour unions is in progress. Such a thing as a strike was hardly ever heard of before the war, but the writer scarcely remembers one large engineering firm in the whole of the Japanese Empire that was not held up by strikes for longer or shorter periods during his stay. One of the characteristics, however, of strikes in Japan is their unanimity. Such a thing as a blackleg is scarcely known, and on this account once the call for a withdrawal of the workers is issued the whole plants involved are closed down. A particular instance of this occurred in Kyushu last December, and the Imperial Steel Works—a Government works employing over 24,000 workers—was shut down for more than three weeks, much to the delight of the American importers of steel. There was the usual batoning and imprisonment of those prominent in the strike, in spite of which the Imperial authorities had to climb down, and by large promises and small concessions persuade the workers to resume.

"A.G.G.'s" allusion to Japan "leaving the war severely" alone is very pathetic but does not touch those workers who understand their position in society. It is obvious that the impulse either of action or of inaction in that regard was the same with every nation, whether belligerent or neutral, and when he expatiates on this point and continues as follows: "no thought of the interests of the Allies, no thought of the interests of China, only the fear that if China became one of the allied States her interests would be better safeguarded in future," one still remains unmoved, knowing what treaties are drawn up for.

The fact that China finally declared war against the Central powers is not mentioned in the article under discussion, otherwise our scribe would have to explain why it was that even after that occurred China's interests were not better guarded than before.

It is quite common knowledge that Japan has been and is still doing her level best to disrupt the internal economy of the Celestial Empire, and maybe the fact that Japan is for the time being foremost in that field is what is causing so much concern to our servants of the cocoa kings!

The whole diatribe against the Japanese absolutely misses the vital points. This is not a matter for surprise, as the literary hacks of the master class are not concerned with fundamentals. The struggle for trade expansion necessitates control of new markets, and the acquisition of new territories in which to settle "surplus" populations. Consequently the Japanese Government have to follow any line which will give them control of new spheres,

and more openly than in the past proclaim the imperialist policy adopted by the other big capitalist countries. These fundamental points are carefully evaded by our author.

In the case of Japan, of course, the necessity for an outlet for the teeming population is urgent, and this will be readily understood when it is mentioned that the population of the country is close on 60 millions, while the habitable portion is probably less than that of Great Britain. Although the area of the country is considerably larger than that of the British Isles, the country is largely covered with mountains, in fact, it has been computed that seven-eighths of its area is thus covered.

The fact of density of population strikes one wherever one goes. The workers' houses have no yard or garden, simply being separated back and front by the streets. When a two-storey house is mentioned it implies two separate dwellings as far as the workers are concerned. It is easy to understand how detrimental to the workers such a condition of living is, and when Government statistics acknowledge tubercular cases to equal 25 per cent. of the population no doubt can remain of the serious effects of this massing together of large numbers of people in limited areas.

To summarise, therefore, it can be said that sooner or later, treaties, or no treaties, Japan will be compelled to find fresh territories, and there will be war. There is no need to make any bones about this point of view. The only hope of the workers lies in the establishment of Socialism, and it is only by Socialism, and not by treaties, that the British and the Japanese workers alike can save themselves from disastrous conflicts in the near future.

Socialism, of course, can only be brought about by Socialists, and it is satisfactory, therefore, to remember that Socialism is becoming more and more discussed in Japan, although owing to police restrictions it is very difficult indeed for an outsider to get into touch with the organisations to ascertain immediately their point of view in order to allow of comparison with the position of the S.P.G.B. D. W. F.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

ACTION—AN ANALYSIS.

Socialists are often accused by Direct Actionists and others of that ilk of being content with "talk, talk, everlasting talk." They say we are continually uttering all sorts of dire threats against the capitalist class, but that we stop at that. When it comes to action, according to them, we are non-starters.

Now what action can the workers take?

They can with advantage take no action other than talking—with tongue and pen and print—and organising, and using the vote, until such time as they have obtained control of the political machinery, for without that control they are helpless.

There are what are known as "constitutional action" and "direct action." The meaning of the first is obviously action in accord with the Constitution.

There are various organisations—political and others alleged to be non-political—who conduct their propaganda mainly by the use of Press and platform, as a means of "peacefully persuading those who pay attention to their case to join them." That is constitutional action.

Good, so far! but another aspect of the matter now presents itself.

Two or more governments have a dispute concerning some question of detail arising out of the administration of territories under their control—usually a question of commerce. What happens?

The disputants endeavour to settle the matter by negotiation. Failing that, one side or the other takes direct action. That is to say, they declare war against the other side.

Vast masses of men with the latest equipment are hurried to the scene of action; new inventions are brought out, and production in general is intensified. That is direct action in practice!

When the workers take direct action that is a crime, because it is unconstitutional, inasmuch as it is action against the ruling class.

But what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander! If it be constitutional for a government to take direct action in the form of a declaration of war, it is also constitutional for the workers to take direct action on the same lines when they obtain that control of political power which is necessary to enable them to do so.

However, our critics must remember that until the workers get that control they, like us, are helpless, and we can do nothing but talk, educate, and organise.

Those who favour "direct action" appear to

be unable to conceive any other form of action. When we start action of any kind other than what we are doing at present, it will be constitutional action expressed in terms of guns and bombs and bayonets. We shall use these instruments of warfare safe in the knowledge that we were backed by a Socialist working class.

We do not wish to kill *anyone*, and if we can accomplish our aims in a peaceful manner well and good. But if the enemy—the capitalist class—resist, then we must use all the forces of the State to enforce our will.

The issue then will not be merely a sectional squabble between national groups of the capitalist class, but it will be a question of the complete abolition of that class itself.

Direct action, as advocated by those of the anti-political school, means political suicide for the workers because it ignores the only factor which can be effective.

When the day of our direct action arrives the ranks of the conscientious objector will be considerably depleted because, whereas on the last occasion those ranks were largely made up of Socialists, in the struggle to come there will be no Socialists amongst the "C.O.'s." In stead they will be found in the revolutionary army, fighting in order to achieve

"THE WORLD FOR THE WORKERS."

"HUTCH."

The attention of comrades is drawn to the fact that we are running an Economic Class at the Head Office. The class meets every Thursday at 8 p.m.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.
SIXTH EDITION,
WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P.,
I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions,
S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence. Post Free, Four Pence
from the S.P.G.B.,
17 Moun Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

LOVE AND HUNGER.

It was a vision

Two angels appeared to me . . . two genii.

I say angels, genii, because both had no clothes on their naked bodies, and behind their shoulders rose long, powerful wings.

Both were youths. One was rather plump, with soft, smooth skin and dark curls. His eyes were brown and full, with thick eyelashes; his look was shy, merry, and eager. His face was charming, bewitching, a little insolent, a little wicked. His full, soft, crimson lips were faintly quivering. The youth smiled as one possessing power—self-confidently and languidly; a magnificent wreath of flowers rested lightly upon his shining tresses, almost touching his velvety eyebrows. A spotted leopard's skin pinned up with a golden arrow, hung lightly from his curved shoulder to his rounded thigh. The feathers of his wings were tinged with rose colour; the ends of them were bright red, as though dipped in fresh-spilt scarlet blood. From time to time they quivered rapidly with a sweet, silvery sound, the sound of rain in spring.

The other was thin, and his skin yellowish. At every breath his ribs could be seen faintly heaving. His hair was fair, thin, and straight; his eyes big, round, pale grey. His glance uneasy and strangely bright. All his features were sharp; the little half-open mouth, with pointed fish-like teeth; the pinched eagle nose, the projecting chin, covered with whitish down. The parched lips never once smiled.

It was a well-cut face, but terrible and pitiless! (Though the face of the first, the beautiful youth, sweet and lovely as it was, showed no trace of pity either.) About the head of the second youth were twisted a few broken and empty ears of corn, entwined with faded grass-stalks. A coarse grey cloth girt his loins; the wings behind, a dull, dark grey colour, moved slowly and menacingly.

The two youths seemed inseparable companions. Each of them leaned upon the other's shoulder. The soft hand of the first lay like a cluster of grapes upon the bony neck of the second; the slender wrist of the second, with its long, delicate fingers, coiled like a snake about the girlish bosom of the first.

And I heard a voice. This is what it said: "Love and hunger stand before thee—twin brothers, the two foundation-stones of all things living.

"All that lives moves to get food, and feeds to bring forth young.

"Love and Hunger—their aim is one; that

life should cease not, the life of the individual and the life of others—the same universal life."

IVAN TURGENEV

In the foregoing, Turgenev has, in his allegorical way, personified very strikingly the two forces to which can be traced the motive-power of all animal activities. The desire to live and the desire to propagate the species are common to all animals; but beyond this, the animal man, since he has developed along the lines which have set him apart from, and ahead of, the lower animals, has evolved further desires, to live as easily and safely as possible, and to be in such an economic position as will allow of his breeding and rearing offspring who shall develop a healthier physique and a higher intelligence than his own.

Let us examine shortly man's place in nature and society looked at from this point of view. A society is defined by Professor Edward Jenks as "a group or mass of people, bound together by a certain common principle or object." A political society, which is the particular type of society we are dealing with at present, the type of society, that is, in which the civilised peoples of the World are to-day grouped and organised, he defines as not being formed for any special or limited objects, but which has grown up, almost spontaneously, as part of the general history of mankind, and which is concerned with its general interests.

The last part of this definition must, however, be taken in a very limited sense. We shall see how far, and in what way, society—present-day capitalist society—is concerned with the general interests of the group of people of whom it is composed. While you have—as you now have—society divided into two classes, of which one is the dominant class and the other the class dominated, you must necessarily have a clash of interests; in which case the advantage of the one section can only react to the disadvantage of the other. To-day, the members of the dominant or master class, by virtue of their possession of all the means of life, are able to maintain their position, as individuals and as a class, only by keeping down, and pressing ever harder upon, the class they dominate—the working or wage-slave class.

So you have a comparatively small number of people who are only able to satisfy (their desire to live (as easily and as safely as possible) and their desire to breed and rear a progeny (healthier and more intelligent than themselves) by keeping the rest of society—i.e., the great majority of the people—in an enslaved, unhealthy, and mentally inefficient condition.

Hunger and love are quite as powerful in

their effect upon the workers as they are upon the masters, but owing to the latter's more intelligent conception of their class position, the one class is able easily and satisfactorily to obtain the necessities and luxuries that make life for the individual, and the extension of that life in the form of the breeding and maintenance of offspring, worth the having; whereas all that the other class—the working class—can do is simply to lead a precarious existence, with little or no outlook for themselves or for the children whom the forces of nature compel them to bring into the world. Hence the paradox that instead of the life of the individual and the maintenance of the race being the concern of society as a whole, one section is fighting another section to the death because only by so doing can it satisfy the insistent demands that the forces of hunger and love make upon the units that compose that particular section.

To the Socialist, with his knowledge of the fundamental forces of nature and their relation to the individual and to society, it seems that such a paradoxical and unnatural condition of things must inevitably end in disaster unless some way can be found by which the equilibrium between man and nature can be satisfactorily adjusted. The contention of the Socialist is that the remedy is to be found in the abolition of the master or capitalist class. It is indisputable that a certain quantity of food, clothing, and shelter is necessary to human existence; without such food, clothing, and shelter mankind would vanish from the face of the globe; but as all the necessities of life are the product of human energy applied to nature's resources, so it follows that actually the only necessary people in society are the people who do the work of the world—that is, the members of the working class.

The master class might very well go out of existence and yet all that is requisite for the maintenance of life still be produced. Food would still be grown and manufactured, clothing still be made, houses still be built, even though such a calamity (!) happened as the extinction of the members of the capitalist class, who, while themselves performing no useful function in society, yet manage to secure for themselves and their dependants the major portion of the wealth produced by the men and women of the working class, without whose efforts mankind would soon pass into oblivion.

The abolition of the capitalist class can only be accomplished by the strenuous efforts of a class-conscious working class. It is obviously futile to expect the capitalist class to abolish itself. Therefore it is that the Socialist Party, by oral and written propaganda, is striving to implant in the minds of the workers the con-

ciousness of their real position in the society in which they live. Not until they have been brought to an appreciation of their position as wage-slaves and a further appreciation of the overwhelming power they possess as a political force, will it be possible for them—by organising with us, in a class-conscious political party—to wrest from their masters the power which will enable them, not only to win their freedom from class-domination, but also enable them, by harmonising their economic position with their desire or will to live and to maintain and develop the species, to secure for themselves and their children initial entrance to the vast and unexplored wonderland of life, only fleeting glimpses of which are at present vouchsafed to them when they are perhaps able to contemplate nature in its pristine grandeur; to watch the demonstrations of a great scientist; or to study the works of a great imaginative and creative artist.

F. J. WEBB

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE MYSTERY OF "SOVEREIGNS AS SOVEREIGNS, AND NOT AS GOLD."

TO THE EDITORS.

Dear Sirs.—I understand that if one attempts to find error in your journal you lead off with "A superstitious Kaffir has," etc. or something similarly showing innate race, creed, and colour bias. However, I will chance it.

F. F. in his article "Paradox or Illusion," challenges Mr. Sandiway to explain why if Bradburys are not gold value they can be exchanged for sovereigns. True, they can be exchanged for sovereigns, but only sovereigns as sovereigns, not sovereigns as gold. Their gold value is limited by the reading of old law and Dora and its export restrictions. Gold on July 27 is quoted 108s. 9d. per oz., which is a considerable margin above sovereigns plus the highest freights to anywhere.

Also in the few lines previous to his challenge F. F. (I hope I am not misreading him) seems to distinguish between gold and commodities more than is necessary between one commodity and another. He must know that gold is merely the most suitable commodity to measure all other commodities, and that otherwise it follows strictly the law of commodities. Gold is a commodity which enters into all transactions simply to facilitate and expedite the barter of old days.—Yours, etc., BANNOCHE.

QUIDS ARE GOLD, REALLY.

When Bannochie says: "True, they can be exchanged for sovereigns," he concedes my point. His further remark "but only sovereigns as sovereigns and not sovereigns as gold" does

not qualify his admission for the simple reason, that sovereigns are gold and gold to the full value represented. When the Government gave notes in exchange for sovereigns they gave, in effect, a receipt for so much gold, and the holder of such a receipt can to-day receive the same quantity of gold by tendering his receipt or note. The pound note has, therefore, the same gold basis that it had when it was first issued, and is accepted within the Empire as representing the sovereign.

The high price of gold in the open market explains itself when we remember that it is illegal to melt down sovereigns and unpatriotic to demand them from the Bank, which has held huge stocks of gold in reserve since the early days of the war.

The amusing side of Bannochie's attempted criticism is that he endeavours to show that the "price of gold" has risen, while my chief concern was to show that its "value had not fallen." Apart from his confusion over the two terms, it is evident that even if his point were proved it would only go to support my contention—that prices have actually risen and not that paper juggling makes it merely appear so.

The distinction between gold and other commodities is that the latter, whatever their magnitude or use, express their value in the former. Gold, in this country, is alone the material in which values can be expressed. The position it occupies to-day is due to its physical properties and the historical development of wealth-production, together with the social relationships arising therefrom. It is, therefore, just as correct to speak of gold and commodities as it is to speak of king and subjects. In neither case can the one exist without the other. To find the origin of such relationships we trace their development backwards. But even when we have done that and discovered that gold is only a commodity, that the king is merely a man, the fact still remains that in one country there is only one king and that gold is the one commodity to obtain which all other commodities are produced. If society persists in distinguishing between gold and commodities even Bannochie must fall into line—in practice. For instance, in times of crisis gold is in demand everywhere, is, in fact, the only form in which wealth is recognised. Again, if Bannochie is a wage-slave with any experience of unemployment, he has been forced to recognise the difference between gold and his commodity, labour-power: the latter is often a drug on the market, and most other commodities have been drugs as well; but when has gold been a drug?

Gold is not merely "the most suitable commodity to measure all other commodities." It

is the substance in which all commodities express their value—a far different thing. When gold has become money it is then the universal equivalent, and all other kinds of wealth are merely commodities. Only when the money commodity is isolated in this way can it fulfil its various functions, as measure of value, as standard of price and circulating medium. The fact that it is generally recognised as the measure of value—its chief function—isolates it from other commodities, but in the process of becoming isolated the days of barter are left behind, and the full development of gold as a circulating medium is a sign that barter (in its simple form of direct exchanges) no longer exists.

F. F.

WHAT DETERMINES THE FORM OF THE SOCIAL SYSTEM?

TO THE EDITOR.

Dear Sir,—In the first chapter of the S.P.G.B. Manifesto Marx and Engels' Communist Manifesto is quoted as stating that "the workers, to secure their emancipation, must first secure the control of the political machine."

This is tantamount to saying that the social organism is determined by Political and not according to the general trend of Marx, "The economic condition of the people."

Is this so?

G. C. W.

OUR REPLY.

Exercising our enormous fund of goodwill to the uttermost in the endeavour to understand you, we conclude that when you speak of the "social organism" you mean the social edifice, structure, system—anything almost but what you say, in fact. To use the words of one who has gone before, is this so?

If it is, then the answer to your question is, brother, it is not so.

The form of the social system is determined, not, as you say Marx said (poor old Marx, how they do love to dance upon your literary relics!) by "the economic condition of the people," but by its economic base.

If you read the first clause of our Declaration of Principles you will see it there stated that society is based upon the private ownership of the means of living. How the form which the social system shall take is determined by this basic factor a little thought should reveal. For instance, the private ownership being confined to a section of the people, it is determined that society shall consist of two classes—those who possess and those who do not; it is also determined by the same factor that those who do not own property must work for wages. Thus it is seen that the two most pregnant characteristics

of present-day society, (1) its division into classes and (2) the wage-labour basis of its productive system, are clearly seen to arise from the private property base.

Now although private property is the basis of present-day society, private property is not an institution which can exist of its own force, like, say, gravitation. Minor infringements on the "rights of private property" are called theft, and our correspondent is presumed by the law to know how such cases are dealt with. Just as such minor cases are dealt with by the minor forces of the State—the police and the beak—so to preserve private property from the major infringements on private property—the revolutionary attack upon its very vitals—there exists the major force, the armed forces of the State.

To say that the wages system, together with the other phenomena peculiar to the present order, rests upon the private property basis of society, is to imply that the emancipation of the workers from wage-slavery can result only from the abolition of private property. This naturally raises the question: How is this to be accomplished in face of the armed forces of the State?

The answer to this is that the workers must either fight the armed forces or control them.

The first course is obviously not to be thought of until the second is closed to us. Therefore the next question is: Through what medium are the armed forces of the nation controlled?

The Army and Navy are part of the machinery of government, or the political machinery. As such they are controlled by Parliament.

That is why we tell the workers that in order to obtain their emancipation they must get control of the political machinery.

Now the point that our correspondent will observe here is that, far from our insistence on the need for capturing the political machinery implying that the political factor determines the form of the social structure, it simply indicates something the workers must do before they can be in a position to deal with the real determining factor in the shaping of society, the private ownership of property. This is the root of the social tree, from which every twig and leaf draws its life; the political machinery is the fence around the tree, to keep donkeys and other things off. To deal with the fence is the necessary preliminary to doing things to the root, but that does not imply that the tree is based on the fence instead of on the root.

ED. COM.

H. DIGHT.—Your criticism has been handed to the writer of the article in question and we hope to publish the reply next month.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Mattheu-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 174 Murdock-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham. Branch meets Sat. at Coffee House, Spicall-st.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Com'tee. Applications to General Secy.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142 Bulwar-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., T. Hall, 48 Mayfield Grove, Gorton, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Exmouth-St. Schools (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High-rd., Willesden-green, N.W.10.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Secy., 207 Derinton-rd., Tooting, S.W. Branch meets Fridays at 143 Beechcroft-rd., Upper Tooting at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Secy., C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 51 Greenleaf-rd., Walthamstow. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday. Visitors invited.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mares-rd., N.22.

**S. P. G. B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS
LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Parliament Hill Fields, 6 p.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Wednesdays:

Tooting, Totterdown Street, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.
Battersea, Mossbury Rd., Lavender Hill, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Colsterworth Rd., High R., 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 150, High St.

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 194. Vol. 17.]

LONDON, OCT., 1920.

[MONTHLY, TWO PENCE]

UTOPIA OR BOLSHEVISM?

A NEW WAY OUT FOR AN ENTERPRISING GOVERNMENT.

"THE PROBLEM OF HEALTHY TOWNS AND A HEALTHY INDUSTRIAL SYSTEM." By Captain J. W. PETAVEL, Lecturer on the Poverty Problem, Calcutta University. Reprinted from "The Englishman," Calcutta, for the Calcutta University Poverty Problem Study Fund. 1920.

In this pamphlet Captain Petavel is chiefly concerned with the physical deterioration of the workers as revealed by official documents compiled for recruiting purposes. He says: "As a matter of fact the well recognised causes of this evil are absolutely removable ones; and though it indeed came to us with our industrial system, and owing to certain conditions that arose with it, these conditions need not have arisen, and could be removed."

What the World Waited For.

But if the Captain's plan is the only solution, the fact that it had to wait for him to discover it disposes of his contention that the evils need never to have been. Obviously the remedy could not be applied until the man was born who discovered it and persuaded those in power to adopt it.

Unfortunately, although referring to the causes as being "well-recognised," the Captain does not explain what they are, and as every party, reformer, and quack has "well-recognised" causes of his own, to fit each particular creed or philosophy, we cannot rectify the omission, and must examine his scheme as he presents it: "a plan to modify our industrial system in order to prevent the appalling physical deterioration for which it is responsible."

The Captain's Muddled Mixture.

This is distinctly unfortunate because the only sensible way to approach any such question is first to trace the evils to their cause and then examine the possibilities of removing the cause.

A further disadvantage is the writer's confu-

sion on the subject of Socialism. First he says that "Socialism, as conceived by its more intelligent advocates; is a plan, not to abolish our industrial system, but to purge it of these evils," which is what he proposes to do himself by means of his plan. Secondly he points out that "if the propertied class does not promptly deal with the evils they will be giving the workers every excuse to try Bolshevism, Socialism, or whatever plausible plan is suggested to them." But if Socialism is what he previously described it to be why should anybody object? In his mind Bolshevism is evidently something bloody and terrible, and Socialism can be the same—if it is only plausible.

Our reformer's most amusing statements about Socialism, however, are the following.

The Queer Side.

On page 1 he says: "As, however, we are not prepared to accept Socialism, what is wanted is an enlightened public opinion, free from party and class spirit, to demand just what measures are necessary to remove them" (the evils). That again is a repetition of his definition of Socialism together with a statement that we are not prepared to accept it; therefore the only thing left is, to get on with it.

On page 12, after a lengthy explanation of his scheme—which is calculated to achieve what the "more intelligent Socialists" have for their object—the Captain suggests that as there are still likely to be people who are not satisfied with the system and demand Socialism, they should be given the opportunity to establish Socialist communities on a small scale, being provided by the Government with the necessary machinery to carry out their experiment. But this, he says, "would not really be Socialism, but would be better described as State organised co-operative production." So that what he first describes as Socialism he afterwards

denies to be Socialism by providing for Socialism within it, which in its turn is not Socialism but something else.

A Treasury of Socialism.

Two pages of this work are devoted to "Guild Socialism," which the writer describes as "one of the most picturesque institutions of the past." His description of the way it would work shows the absurdity of this remark. "The Guild undertakes work and divides it among its members, so that all have their share of it and of pay. When there is a great deal of work, all work long hours, when there is less, all work a short time; the more work there is the more money there is coming in, and the guild pays everybody proportionately more."

Nothing is said as to what should determine the numbers to be admitted to each guild; it being obviously to the interest of every member to keep out new-comers, in order to keep the share-out higher. On a small scale this idea is already in operation in many factories to-day, where the working day is shortened or lengthened in accordance with the state of trade. It is no solution to the working-class "problem." It is not even an improvement, because there is no more to divide than previously. The product of labour is still shared between the capitalists, who do not share in its production, and the workers, who get the meanest and poorest share.

To the latter every plan must be unsatisfactory that includes any provision whatever for a class that rules, yet does not justify its existence.

Capitalists could Ruin—Themselves.

Having seen how confused Captain Petavel is on the subject of Socialism, we shall not be surprised to discover that his ideas on capitalism and capitalists are none too clear. On page 18 he says: "A democratic government has it in its power absolutely to ruin town landlords. It could, on the perfectly sincere plea of public health, acquire large tracts of cheap land away from the towns, and let them out for building at fixed rates, making the railways convey the people to and fro for the smallest coin in circulation."

A democratic government could do these things and many more; but would they?

Captain Petavel's scheme depends for its finance on a system of heavy taxation of land values; which he says, by the way, would be no hardship to the landlords, since they could have full compensation.

How this is to be effected and the money still be available to finance the scheme does not appear, unless it is by the same method that the Jersey Corporation adopted when it pro-

posed to build its market hall for nothing. Captain Petavel is enamoured of this scheme, though he tells us why it failed. "The money lenders put the law into operation against it and had it stopped, so that the full advantage was not realised." They evidently saw who would be at a disadvantage, though even now the Captain fails to see that anybody could suffer from a scheme so apparently innocent.

Unconsidered Trifles.

Captain Petavel's scheme is mainly concerned with the material basis of the present industrial system. Social relationships, interests, and class antagonisms are shunted over or altogether ignored. The re-arrangement of towns according to a settled plan, and the improvement of transport are the biggest items on his programme. His idea of town-planning is that the big business houses should occupy the centre of the towns, and that the roads should radiate outwards like the spokes of a wheel. These roads should be wide, with fenced-in tramways and elevated stopping places to bring the cars rapidly to rest and re-start them. Books of tickets should be issued to the workers at rates varying according to the rents they paid, thus ensuring a cheap and rapid service.

These main roads could be occupied by business concerns, stores, etc., while behind them, in the angles formed by the roads converging toward the centre, could be residential dwellings with open spaces, small near the centre, and larger toward the outskirts.

A Bit Late.

Like all town-planning schemes in this country, however, this one is invented after the towns have grown up, and the cost of alterations, together with the serious interference with capitalist interests which it would involve prevents anything being done on a large scale.

To meet this difficulty Captain Petavel proposes a tax on land values, every site to be taxed according to the profit made on it, or according to its proximity to the centre of the town. Some would pay the tax and thus provide the cost, while others would take the cheaper sites further out and thus enable the authorities to re-arrange the towns on the new plan.

In towns planned in this way, the space between the roads would, of course, be greater as the distance from the centre was increased. This space could be used for recreation grounds or for agriculture. The chief advantage, says the Captain, would come to the workers by this arrangement; they could occupy the outlying districts, where vacant land would be plentiful. They could then produce the bulk of their food-stuffs for themselves. Their food would thus be fresh, and it would only be necessary

for them to work a very few hours in the factories per day.

The towns would thus be healthier, the workers would spend most of their time in healthy occupations, and only a very short time in the poisonous atmosphere and monotonous tasks of the factory.

The grounds on which the Captain pleads for his scheme are the health and efficiency of the workers. Better health and greater efficiency make for greater production, and therefore higher profits for the capitalist class. It is quite obvious, therefore, that the workers would still be wage-slaves, exploited by a class above them, a class that owns the means of wealth production.

Captain Petavel puts his plan forward as an alternative to Socialism. If he succeeds in persuading the capitalist class to adopt it, the evils of the capitalist system will still remain, because they are bred by the system, and the system remains.

Whatever changes or reforms the ruling class may decide to introduce, the duty of the workers is to organise politically for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. They must refuse to be side-tracked by reformers, Bolshevik wild men, or Utopians.

F. F.

WE INVADE THE POTTERIES.

A NEW BRANCH AT HANLEY.

It is our pleasurable task to announce the formation of a new Branch—at Hanley, Staffs. As will be seen from the advertisement in the Branch Directory, the Branch meets at the Working Men's Club, Glass Street, Hanley, on Wednesday evenings. We are unable at the moment to give the time of these meetings, but enquiry of the Secretary, J. Gallagher, 10 Sidney Street, Hanley, will elicit this information. Comrade Gallagher will also be happy to give any other particulars concerning the Branch or the Party to enquirers.

All sympathisers within practical range of Hanley are cordially invited to attend the meetings of the new Branch, and, if they agree with our principles and policy, to join up and get their shoulder to the wheel of old capitalism's hearse. They may be sure of a comradely welcome and of finding themselves in company with lads who mean business.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

"CHECK TO THE BISHOP."

Bishop Welldon is very amusing: he asks ridiculous questions and raises a laugh—against himself! As witness the following:

"What can be more ridiculous amongst the Labour parties than that a few men who clamour for the abolition of international warfare should be the first and foremost to declare industrial warfare by striking again and again for increases of wages."

"If arbitration is the proper means of settling disputes among nations it must be the proper means among classes too. If the hope of civilisation lies in the League of Nations, is there no hope in, no need of, a league of classes?"

—"Daily News," 25.8.20.

Like most of the men in clerical camps, he suffers from confusion of ideas when he deals with economics and politics.

There is one thing, though, that he has learned, namely, that THERE ARE CLASSES in our present day society.

That is a good basis from which to investigate the composition of the social structure; it will lead him to understand why there is a class division, and may possibly lead him to understand the principles of Socialism.

The bishop speaks of the Labour parties, by which I take it he means the whole of the various groups supposed to represent the interest of the working class, as though their two mentioned activities were inconsistent and absurd. They are: (1) clamouring for the abolition of international warfare; (2) declaring industrial warfare by striking again and again for increases of wages.

These things are quite understandable, for the first, international warfare, means that it is working class who have to wage war on behalf of the master class, and have to risk physical and mental ruin, and death itself, for the war-making capitalists.

They have to destroy in warfare, the workers of other countries, who are similarly pitted against them.

The workers of all lands are wage slaves. They have the same miserable lot, of whatever race they may be. Also, let Bishop Welldon understand, they have one common foe—the capitalist class the world over.

And bishops, whether well done or only half baked, generally can be relied upon to back up the latter most religiously.

With regard to the workers "declaring industrial warfare by striking again and again for increases of wages," it would be well for the Bishop to grasp the fact that, so long as the

wages system continues there will be strife between those who own the means of wealth-production and those who operate those means for wages.

The workers are only allowed access to the instruments of labour in order that they may produce more wealth than they have returned to them in the form of wages, hence they are exploited—robbed. And as a natural consequence they try to lessen the extent of that exploitation by struggling for increases of wages. Even a bishop would do the same.

And the strike—the withholding of our labour-power—to gain a tiny advantage is one of the weapons that labour is self-defensively compelled to use. The employers, on their part, make war on labour—generally with success. They “speed up” production on the one hand, and on the other eliminate wherever possible anything that threatens their chance of extracting surplus-value from the economically forced labour of their slaves.

But bishops, as a rule, don't see that side of the shield. They want the wheels of industry running smoothly so that Rent, Interest, and Profit shall be assured to the class to which they belong. And they supply the oil of admonition in order to keep the workers docile, diligent, and contented in the position in which “Providence” places them.

What we of the Socialist Party have to declare stoutly is that the working class don't go for the root of the matter—only the Socialists do.

We of the S.P.G.B. are out for the abolition of the wages system—the result of the private ownership of the means of life. We want the workers to grip the fact that it is just this—the way in which these means are used against our class by our exploiters—that causes all the misery.

We desire the overthrow of the capitalist system, and in its place the establishment of Socialism. Then production for the use of all will take the place of the pernicious production for the profit of a few, and a new and splendid era will open up for mankind.

More clamour against international warfare will not prevent its occurrence. War after war will and must be waged while capitalism lasts. Why? Because under capitalism it is the conflict of capitalist groups that starts the war machinery, and the battle field is the arena where is decided what fails to be decided in the political ring.

The Bishop thinks highly of arbitration. He considers that if it is the proper means among nations it must be the proper means among classes too.

Let it be said right here that we of the S.P.G.B. say the day of arbitration is long past.

We wage war against CAPITALISM, and therefore are out to rid the earth of it. We look on it as the social upas-tree, whose very shade is blighting!

And the world's workers, when they are educated in economics and Socialist principles, and organised for the capture of political power, will soon annihilate it root and branch.

There is no hope for a capitalist-formed “League of Nations”: thieves who quarrel over the commercial “swag” once will quarrel over it again!

There is no hope of a “league of classes.” The Bishop, if he thinks, must admit it to be “ridiculous.”

We want the abolition of the system causing the class division. We desire the speedy overthrow of the bloody system that is built up out of working-class slavery and exploitation.

We are out for SOCIALISM!

GRAHAM MAY.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF SOCIALIST THEORY.

(Continued.)

Perhaps it would not be out of place here to refer briefly to two statements made by the advocates of industrial action as arguments against political action.

The first is the statement that Parliamentary leaders always betray the workers and a Socialist delegate would do the same.

In the first place “leaders” almost invariably betray, and those who trust in “leaders” deserve to be betrayed. But, apart from that, is it only Parliamentary “leaders” that have betrayed the workers? Have the latter never been betrayed on the industrial field? A cursory examination of the multitude of strikes that have taken place during even recent years will provide myriads of examples of betrayal on the part of those “leaders” whom the workers were foolish enough to entrust with power to make settlements (behind closed doors!) in industrial disputes. How often and how regularly are the workers sold in the agreements the trade union leaders make with the employers! The last railway and coal disputes are cases in point, and another illustration will be provided in the fresh coal dispute that, at the time of writing, is looming on the horizon.

When the workers get out of their heads the demoralising idea of leadership there will be less room for the betrayer and less heard of betrayal.

The main point of the matter is that Socialist Parliamentary delegates will have no means of

betraying those who appoint them. They will be given their instructions, and if the instructions are not carried out their career will be ended, and they will have betrayed none but themselves. Delegates will be selected according to their capacity to carry out the instructions of those who appoint them, and a loud voice or truculent demeanour will carry little weight with a class-conscious electorate.

The second point we wish to refer to is that claiming that Marx and Engels were not in favour of the workers striving to obtain control of the political machinery. The basis of this contention is a sentence in “The Civil War in France” that has been torn from its context. The sentence is: “The working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made machinery and wield it for its own purposes.”

This statement appears before Marx's summary of the development of the State, and he then goes on to show why the working class cannot wield it for its own purposes. The reason is that the State is a repressive power used against a subject class. As there will be no subject class in the new society there will be no use for a repressive power. In other words, that capitalist State machinery will not be applicable to Socialism, as the place of a repressive power will be taken by administrative machinery. Marx nowhere suggests that the workers should abstain from laying hold of the State machinery. On the contrary, the argument that follows the above quotation makes it clear that the workers must take this power out of the hands of the capitalists, and illustrates how the Communards accomplished this end and then set about constructing administrative machinery to suit the new economic conditions where State power was unnecessary.

As a matter of fact, Engels, in his introduction to the German edition of Marx's work, places the matter beyond doubt when he says: “From the very outset the Commune had to recognise that the working class, having once attained supremacy in the State, could not work with the old machinery of government.”

Engels concludes his introduction with the following pregnant remarks:

But in reality the State is nothing else than a machine for the oppression of one class by another class, and that no less so in the democratic republic than under the monarchy. At the very best it is an inheritance of evil, bound to be transmitted to the proletariat when it has become victorious in its struggle for class supremacy, and the worst features of which it will have to lop off at once, as the Communards did, until a new race, grown up under new, free social conditions, will be in a position to shake off from itself this State rubbish in its entirety.—“The Paris Commune,” New York Labor News Co., 1919.

After the Hague Congress of September 1872 Marx addressed a meeting in Amsterdam, when he said:

A group had arisen in our midst which proclaimed working-class abstinence from political work.

We deemed it our duty to declare how dangerous and how threatening such opinions may become to our cause.

The worker must, sometime, get the political power into his own hands, in order to lay the foundation of a new organisation of labour. He must overthrow the old political system that upholds the old institutions, unless he is ready, like the old Christians—to sacrifice the “Kingdom of this world.”—Quoted from “Socialist Documents.” Appeal Socialist Classics (America).

GILMAC.

To Be Continued.

THE REASON OF IT.

To save the next generation is, according to “Lloyd's News” (8.8.20) the mission of a tearing campaign through London, that is to be inaugurated by a “distinguished body” representing all denominations and young people's organisations, headed by Mr. Lloyd George and the Bishops of Barking and Stepney.

These gentlemen, fresh from the contemplation of the divine spectacle of the butchery of millions of working men, the starvation of millions of working-class women and children, the drowning of thousands of seamen, the murder of miners, the atrocity of Amritsar, recoil with horror from the “paganism” of the rising generation.

Therefore, fellow workers, Lloyd George and Co. would fain lead your little ones away from the “appalling examples of licentiousness all around them.” To do this they will not consider such sordid material things as tenement life, child factory labour, insufficient and adulterated food, clothing, etc., in short, the beastly conditions in which the children are reared. No! They will appeal to the heart, because to admit that conditions are responsible would of necessity involve the alteration of those conditions.

David, however, is not concerned about the vices or virtues of the workers, but, as the representative of the capitalist class, he is perturbed at the growing tendency of the workers to question and criticise the institutions of capitalism.

Mr. George knows that in view of the more frequent and more violent manifestations of the class struggle, greater attention must be paid to the dulling of the intellects of the potential wage slaves. Those beautiful dreams: Homes

for Heroes: Fields of Waving Corn, have failed to materialise. Instead there are the keener competition of children with their parents, a growing army of unemployed, prostitution, famine, and disease rampant, dark clouds hovering over the industrial field, and the probability of more wars. No wonder that our children will have need of the "corrective of the self-discipline of Christianity."

So our far-seeing capitalists see to it that every inducement is made to working-class children, to entice them into the wage-slave organisations—the boy scouts, girl guides, bands of dope and glory, etc. Our children must be taught to believe in the humility of man, the sanctity of poverty, the shame of idleness, the chastening influence of disease—for the workers. Yes! Because the capitalist class desires "good and faithful servants," cheap, docile, and ignorant wage slaves. And to get them there is no better preparative than religion.

While the worker's head is full of such notions as God, the devil, and the hereafter, to him his slave condition on this planet is a minor affair. He looks upon his revolting conditions as heaven-sent and unchangeable. That his life and destiny should be controlled in just the same way as the machine which he is compelled to tend gives him no food for thought. The ownership by a small section of society of the economic resources of the whole community, "always has been and always will be"—in his mind!

The Socialist, however, has analysed society from top to bottom. He knows and understands the laws of the development of the social organism. Religion he explains as having its origin in ancestor worship, and owing its development to the changing economic conditions, which will also be responsible for its disappearance in the future. The poverty and degradation of the working class to-day he knows is due to the private ownership of the means of life.

Therefore, reader, he suggests to you that instead of thinking about "changing your heart," you should consider the alteration of the basis of society—to establish in place of the present system, one based on the common ownership and democratic control of the means of producing and distributing wealth.

What is your view?

A. H.

"KNOWLEDGE IS POWER."

Economic Class at Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. (off Farringdon Road) on Thursdays at 8 p.m. Try to attend.

"A WORLD TO WIN."

One of the finest things ever penned is the clarion call of Karl Marx: "Wage Workers of the World Unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains, you have a World to win."

Thoughtless scoffers may deride the profound truths embodied in these vital words, but they are built out of facts, and are impregnable against the assaults of anti-Socialists.

What is the extraordinary significance of this phrase to the working class? Consider the world as it is to-day—the wage-workers and their general conditions first of all.

The working class are divorced from the essentials for producing wealth: they own neither the land nor the means and instruments by which the natural resources are, by their class alone, utilised and transformed into wealth. The expenditure of their labour-power creates all economic wealth, but that wealth is appropriated by their exploiters, the capitalist class, who own the means of life. Out of the total value alone produced by our class, we receive but a small portion—wages—to keep us in bare subsistence to enable us to "carry on" from day to day.

The sole function of the worker is to create wealth in order to produce a surplus-value, i.e., a value which is unpaid for, for their masters. Slaves thus, to the class that own all the means of producing wealth and appropriate all the products, they exist to serve the interests of the exploiting class only. Commodities being produced only for profit, a market must be found for them. They are sold in the long run at their value, and realise profit for their sellers. But embodied in a commodity is far more value created by the labour expended in its production than has been received by the workers for producing it. Practically every single commodity in the world, in fact, contains unpaid labour. And they are all produced by wage-slaves. Through the fleecing wages-system the greater part of the value of all commodities represents the robbery of their producers through capitalist exploitation.

Their labour-power is bought solely for that purpose!

They have to toil far longer than is necessary to create the wealth they require to maintain themselves; and the surplus labour-time produces a surplus-value for the exploiting class.

At present the latter are the masters of the world: they own and control humanity's means of life. Their class interests are upheld in every sphere—industrial, social, political. Press, pulpit, and platform reflect their will and make secure their dominance.

And above all they have and wield the political power. Through that alone the Army, Navy, and Police obey their will, and laws are shaped to protect their interests.

Is, then, the position of the workers hopeless? Emphatically no! They will inevitably be freed from the chains binding them—but the workers alone can and will make them snap. The development of the capitalist system engenders an ever-increasing strife through the innate opposition of interests, proletarian and capitalistic. The workers are driven by the economic forces ringing them round to increased class-consciousness.

What irony that the world is owned and controlled by the capitalists, and a shackled proletariat run the whole concern for them!

Only the workers can free it from the bonds of a pernicious system. "Wage-workers of the World, Unite!" says Marx. The solidarity of the workers, keenly conscious of their class interests and aims, and educated to see their goal and the way to it, will, with organisation, prepare them for capitalism's overthrow.

Crisis after crisis will occur, ever intensifying, as the present system increases in complexity and becomes unworkable. The more the workers feel the economic pinch the more will they be ready for our propaganda. And Socialist propaganda will have its effect. The proletarians' chains will chafe unbearably.

Then will come the Social Revolution!—brought about as the result of capitalism's inability to solve the problems it has created.

Having captured political power, the workers will control it and its adjuncts, overthrowing the present regime and establishing in its place the Socialist Commonwealth.

They have nought but their chains to lose! They have EVERYTHING to gain by a Socialist system of society. No other class but their own will emancipate them from wage-slavery. No other means but the seizing of the political power, the capture of the machinery of government through the ballot, will enable them to effect their purpose—it's the key!

The economic resources of the world, then, will be organised for the use and benefit of the community as a whole, by the only class that counts—the workers.

Production for profit will be superseded by production for social use. Exploitation will be extinguished, class ownership of the means of life having been displaced by social ownership in a society in which the class barriers are swept away.

The wondrous means of large-scale production—prolific beyond even our wildest dreams as soon as the stifling hand of capitalism is removed from it—will enable society to create

a superabundance of wealth with a minimum of effort—sufficient for all without toil, so that none need look askance at what another eats or enjoys, no hand may be niggard toward its neighbour, and no back warped and bent with drudgery.

As all who are able will have to contribute their share to the work of producing the social wealth, and there will be no parasitic idlers of any kind to maintain, it follows that the daily social effort will furnish abundance for ALL with an unimagined facility.

Thus man's life will not be as now, one long drudgery of wealth-production to enrich the coffers of an idle and thievish class—but it will be life indeed!—full and free as only the conquest of the forces of nature, and equality in the enjoyment of the economic fruits and advantages of that conquest, can afford.

Also all the evils inseparable from capitalism—its inevitable products, in fact, will disappear. Unemployment, overwork, want, prostitution, and all the preventable evils will cease to exist along with capitalism itself.

Mankind, liberated from wage-slavery, will at last be free! Society then will be one in which oppression, class-rule, and all the anomalies of the present order will have disappeared. The impetus this will give (through the reorganisation by a revolutionary class on a sane economic basis and the consequent liberation of that class) to the devotion of society to things of real worth will be tremendous. The fullest opportunity to gain and keep health of mind and body; the development of each individual citizen's finest abilities and innate qualities will be accorded every facility; and culture and all that makes life worth living from youth to old age will, under Socialism alone be the birthright of all.

Isn't such a world worth winning? Compared with the sordid system of the present day the gain for the workers is indeed immeasurable.

The toilers have even now the means at hand for realising Socialism, for they have the preponderance of the votes. All that is lacking is an understanding of their class slavery and how Socialism will free them from it.

Think it over, fellow workers. Consider its meaning to you and your class. Socialism is inevitable, but the sooner you are ready for it the sooner you will be able to establish it.

It rests with you, the workers of the world, to liberate yourselves from your slavery, and rid the world of a blighting system of capitalist exploitation.

Workers of all lands, unite! you have only your chains to lose: you have a world to win!

GRAHAM MAY.

is definite, and obviously it is applicable only to a system where the married woman is dependent on her husband. That is to say, where care of the household and the bearing of children are not a concern of society as a whole, but the private business of the male head of each family. Plainly, too, it is an evil that will only vanish when the vital functions of maternity and housewifery again become a public service—when not the monogamous family, but the individual human being, is the economic unit of society.

The scope of our enquiry, then, must be this: Out of what system of production did the family as we know it arise, and what is its logical future development?

Let us briefly glance at the origin and growth of the human family, as made known by the research of many scientists. In this direction one name stands pre-eminant—that of Lewis Morgan, Miss Burr's countryman. By a different road he arrived at the same result as Marx—the formulation of the theory that the foremost dynamic factor in history is the reproduction of the material requirements of life. During the 43 years since his main work was published further investigation has but confirmed his principle findings.

According to Morgan, during the period of savagery, when property consisted of the simplest of articles, and none owned accumulations of wealth which they might wish their children to inherit, group marriage existed. This was itself a development from an earlier condition of unrestricted sexual intercourse within the tribe, and constituted every woman within the group the wife of every man, and vice versa. At its earliest appearance the groups were very broad; as one set of relatives after another was excluded from sexual intercourse, they narrowed. Obviously in such groups only female lineage could be traced; therefore women, as the acknowledged parents of children, were held in high respect. When the continued narrowing of marriage groups resulted in the pairing family within the communal household, the women still ruled there. But with the rearing of herds and keeping of slaves during barbarism, came the accumulation of private property in the tools of production, which, according to the division of labour, and consequently of property, belonged to the man. This ownership gave the husband the superior position in the household, but according to the traditional custom, his wealth was inherited, not by his children (for he was not acknowledged their parent) but by certain of his relatives on his mother's side.

Therefore in widely different nations and

times, so soon as the means of production became private property in the hands of men, was the "maternal law" overthrown. The wife became the bearer of her husband's children, the superintendent of his slaves. Nominally either party could still dissolve the marriage at pleasure, but actually, of course, the woman was bound to the man who held the food and instruments for producing food.

In the monogamous family, which next developed, and which among the Greeks attained its severest form, even this nominal freedom of the wife disappeared. The marriage was made permanent, and the wife bound to chastity by severest penalties—even under pain of death. Not so the husband. He had the right to demand the surrender of his females slaves, and intercourse with prostitutes was by no means condemned. "Supremacy of the man in the family, and generation of children that could be his offspring alone and were destined to be the heirs of his wealth—these were openly avowed by the Greeks to be the sole objects of monogamy." (Engels, "Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State," p. 79.)

We see, then, that with the passing of tribal communism and the development of private property in the means of life, the monogamous family became the economic unit of society. "In the ancient communistic household, comprising many married couples and their children, the administration entrusted to women was just as much a public function, a socially-necessary industry, as the procuring of food by men." (Engels, "Origin of the Family," p. 89.) In the transition to monogamy this social character of women's work disappeared. Hers became a private service within the unit—the monogamous family. It was no longer the business of society, but of the husband, to supply her with the necessities of life; and this dependence bound her to him more effectively than legal ties, though these, as we well know, speedily came into existence.

Appearing on the threshold of civilisation, and being the form of the family generally corresponding to it, monogamy has endured through feudalism up to capitalism, with legal changes conforming first to feudal, then to capitalist, ideology. And its character of being monogamy only for women, stamped upon it by the practice of "enjoying" young female slaves, persists also to the present day. This by no means signifies that chastity among men is unknown, but simply that it is not necessary to the form, and that sexual irregularities are judged more leniently in a man than in a woman. The nominal denunciation of prostitution by the present-day ruling class is mainly

confined to the women who practice it, and seldom touches the men who employ them.

This shows by how much Dame Butt's remark, quoted above, misses the truth. The "one-sided laws" of which she complains are not the cause of the subjection of married women; on the contrary, the economic conditions which involved that degradation created a sex relationship which found its expression in "one-sided laws."

We have pursued our enquiry so far with respect to conditions during married life, and it may perhaps have been assumed that in the actual coming together of young people there has usually been a freedom of choice which was a kind of guarantee of marital happiness. Unfortunately, the facts do not confirm this assumption. In the stage of the pairing family (where separation began for the first time to be difficult of accomplishment), the marriage was arranged by the mothers of the bride and bridegroom, without their consent and often without their knowledge. In the succeeding patriarchal family, the agreement was between the fathers, and with usually quite other aims than the happiness of the betrothed.

So in monogamy, during the middle ages, marriage contracts were arranged in the interest of the house or realm, to which individual preference had to bow. Such submission was regarded as the duty of young people. Feudalism passing away, capitalist ideas required that both contracting parties should be free, and theoretically gave to both women and men the right of choice. Yet it is well known that in practice marriages of choice in the ruling class are the exception. In capitalist countries where a portion of the parental wealth is legally assured to the children, the consent of parents to a marriage must be obtained; and in capitalist countries where consent is not necessary, the children may be disinherited. Individual preference here has little more opportunity to assert itself than under any previous social system; and if, as often happens, the match is an ill-sorted one, and one partner wishes to dissolve it, the dependence of the woman forbids it, and consolation has to be sought, if at all, outside the marriage tie.

These are the results of the subjection of women, to the ruling class of our day. What of the proletarians?

At first glance they appear happier, in that they have greater freedom of choice—the parents of young workers having nothing to gain by the marriage—and because most industries are now open to women, with the result that they can leave their husbands, and support

themselves, if necessary, as do the men, by selling their labour-power to the capitalists.

But immediately on the appearance of children the position is changed. The working-class mother who wishes to tend her own children has no alternative but to remain dependent on her husband.

We have now arrived at the condition against which Miss Burr rebels. She sees only one remedy—the professional mother, who will care for the children of working women in order to leave them free to enter the labour market; and, naturally, draws impassioned protest from women who want to "mother" their children themselves. She sees only one remedy because she assumes the indefinite continuance of the capitalist system, within which, we have seen, a woman cannot be a wife and mother and remain free.

But this system is not immutable. Like those out of which it grew, it will break down so soon as the possibility of a more highly developed form of production has developed within it. The new form will be the collective organisation of production—realised by transforming the privately-owned means of life into common property, which process will abolish the subjection of women to men, as it will abolish the subjection of employed to employer.

With the disappearance of the conditions which made the monogamous family the economic unit—private property and inheritance—it will cease to function as such, and the unit will again be what it was under primitive communism—the individual human being. The freedom and equality of that early society will be restored, but in the stead of the tribe will stand the world-wide community; the simple social tasks which satisfied the few needs of early mankind will have been replaced by a complex system of industry, competent to provide the manifold necessities and luxuries of modern life. No man holding the power to starve another, no man can then bind his fellows to be his industrial slaves, nor a woman to be his domestic slave.

In the Socialist Commonwealth, where the products of all labour will be the common wealth, the work of a wife and mother will be as highly valued as the work of a ploughman or a goldsmith. The making of a strong and beautiful citizen will be as important as the making of a strong and beautiful ship. Her service will be a social service, rewarded by society.

Thus will the New Relationship which Miss Burr so desires be realised. Only voluntarily will a woman surrender herself; with no thought but of happiness in the union will a

man take her. If the union prove unhappy either will be free to dissolve it, for neither is dependant upon, nor responsible for, the other in the material sense. If we are honest we shall frankly grant here, that not all men and women are temperamentally disposed to lifelong constancy. Some love sincerely and ardently for a period only, and when that period has passed, separation is natural and reasonable. Such pain as a separation causes to the partner who may be more constant, though keen, is not worse than would be felt by the other in remaining.

On the other hand, the sordid cases which now embitter the domestic life of the proletarians will be absent, leaving much less room for disillusionment and mutual impatience. True constancy (as distinct from its present-day apology where a union endures under force of necessity) will probably be usual.

Like other social institutions—the law, no longer used to protect exploiters; education, no more directed to the purpose of producing docile and capable wage slaves; art, dependent never again upon the scant appreciation of poor men with minds blunted by ignorance and toil, and rich men with heads full of rubber, oil, or soap—marriage will reflect the free and comradesly relations of economic life.

Love, which in degrading conditions is a weakly thing, will then grow radiant and strong, and marriage no longer fall like a curtain on romance.

A.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF THE

SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

SIXTH EDITION,

WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence. Post Free, Four Pence from the S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

A FUGITIVE COLOUR.

From an account of an interview with a Shoreditch councillor published in the "Hackney and Kingsland Gazette," Sept. 6th, 1920, it would appear to the reader of that paper that a revolution was likely to commence in Shoreditch, to be followed by a "Soviet System of Government." Having been elected to the Council as a "Labour member," this gentleman thinks that although he has "turned Communist" he is still entitled to keep his seat on the Council, and is apparently of the opinion that as he has changed his views, the views of the electors have changed also. He therefore contends that Shoreditch has "gone red."

He tells the representative of our contemporary that he "refused to have anything to do with a local 'Council of Action,'" and denounced all councils, yet he is in favour of still more councils ("Soviets") and a seat on the Council (Shoreditch Borough Soviet) although this Soviet "can do nothing."

This Councillor has yet to learn that it requires something more than "to get elected" to any body, whether it be local council or House of Commons, in order to accomplish anything in the workers' interest.

It requires knowledge on the part of the electors and their continued support.

The local Labour Party was returned at the last election in a large majority, but has not attempted to deal with the huge amount of poverty, the great shortage of houses and other questions that face the workers in Shoreditch as elsewhere. They have fought among themselves for PLACE AND HONOURS, and while the Mayor stated that his Council would refuse to pay the police rate, police are still to be found in that borough, and the bailiffs are not yet in the Town Hall.

These councillors are afraid to move in any serious attempt deal with the working-class questions because they might lose their seats at the next election. Any party could out-reform them at reforming in the same way that they reform—that is by promising. So they merely hold tight, sit and attempt to look wise, with no more idea of which way to turn to set about the task they were elected for than they have of refusing the plums of office that fall from the rich man's table.

Friend Councillor.—The workers do not require "soviet systems of government." They have had and are getting enough government. What they require is Socialism, but they don't know enough about it yet. Socialism does away with government and brings administration. Government implies a class that cannot administer, and so must be governed by the

section of society; it also implies that the present system of production for profit shall continue and the continuance of the present system of private ownership in the means of life.

So before any section of the workers "turn red" they must understand that this system of private ownership in the means of wealth production and distribution is the cause of their poverty and misery, that they are poor because they are robbed as a result of being compelled to sell their labour power to the class that own.

They must learn, further, that the interests of the working class, and of the non-working, employing, and owning class are opposed; that the struggle which the workers carry on with the masters for better conditions, fewer hours of employment, etc. arises from the propertyless and propertyless condition of the two classes, and the attempt of those classes to live out of the wealth produced by the working class, each class struggling to obtain as big a share as possible.

The masters take advantage of all the means at their disposal to compel the workers to, not only increase the total wealth production, but to accept and be content with, the smallest possible part of the total that will suffice to keep the workers alive and able, or fit, to continue wealth production.

Soviets or councils are but part of the governmental machine, and the masters have long since understood that the class that has control of that governmental machine are in the position of governors. So they seek always to capture control through their political parties, and to swing the workers' votes to their assistance to that end. It does not matter what label the party has, if its policy is to continue capitalism; they can control the machine through all such parties. The reforms that are the planks in the programmes of these parties can be used, not only to content the workers, but to run the system more economically.

The workers must learn a lesson from the masters and build up an organisation for themselves; and as only a change from the system of private, to the common ownership of the means of life, can alter the poverty conditions of the workers (that should be the object of the workers' party and that only) they should control their organisation and its members and seek to capture the governmental forces to aid them in their struggle against the capitalist class.

In so doing they take away the power that the capitalists have and add power unto themselves. The workers should not only elect their

members to local and national bodies, but should also control the policy of those elected and see that a change in the opinions and policy of those elected is also followed by a change in the delegate and not a change in the opinions of the electors.

Then and then only can and do the workers "turn Red" and colour-blindness disappear.

TIMS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THOSE MISREPRESENTATIONS OF MARX TURN UP AGAIN.

TO THE EDITORS.

Dear Sirs,

I have formed certain conceptions concerning the nature of a proletarian revolution which are somewhat critical to the position you adopt, and my reason for writing is to get you, if possible, to reply to, or to deal with, what I conceive to be the Marxian position concerning same, a position which opposes yours.

From my reading of Marx and Engels I find that on the question of Parliament you antagonise the Marxian position, even though you claim your organisation to be Marxian.

We accept Marx and Engels, of course, only in as far as their position can be accepted upon its merits, and I assume, therefore, that, as you claim to be Marxian, you will find me quite in order if I did a little quoting from Marx and Engels in opposition to your attitude toward this question.

Under the circumstance of your Marxian claim, how do you reconcile the following statements by Marx and Engels with your declarations, as well as those of your speakers, that Parliament is the political machine that will be used for the purpose of emancipating the workers? In the preface to the "Communist Manifesto" Marx and Engels quote from Marx's "Civil War in France" to the effect that "the working class simply cannot lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes." Does this not run counter to your statement (to quote J.F. in last month's issue of the "S.S.") "when they"—(that is the working class previously mentioned by J.F.)—"agree with Socialism, they will send Socialists" to Parliament? There is no statement that that mode of procedure on the part of the workers would be wrong, but rather does the writer make the terms Parliament and Power synonymous. He indicates as well what would be to him an obvious reply to his question when he asks why the workers "did not vote themselves into power" by voting for Parliament, which serves again to show that, by direct statement

and inference you regard Parliament to be the political instrument for working-class emancipation.

From your conception of the political struggle one would conclude that the struggle occurs only at election times, whereas "every class struggle" being "a political struggle" ("Communist Manifesto"), the political struggle is being prosecuted now and at all times. Again, Marx wrote referring to the Paris Commune that "the Commune was to have been not a parliamentary but a working corporation," and in the same passage he derides the Parliamentary corporation by comparing how the "working corporation" operated "instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to 'represent' and repress the people in Parliament." (Quoted by Lenin, "State and Revolution.") Then again in reference to the Commune Marx says: "its true secret was this. It was essentially the government of the working class—it was the political form, at last discovered, under which Labour could work out its own economic emancipation" (*ibid*). I would, if the question was discussed on its merits, say that if constitutional Parliamentary action will emancipate the workers, then it will be a departure from the historic fact that there can be no such thing as a constitutional social revolution.

In conclusion I will refer you to the proud concluding passage of the "Communist Manifesto," which is quite different to "a cross-next-to-his-name-and-into-the-ballot-box-revolution." "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can only be attained by the forcible overthrow of existing social conditions. Let the ruling class tremble at the prospects of a Communist revolution." I contend that as parliamentarians you conceal your views and aims—if you are Communists; or else you are not Communists, in which case why are you parliamentarians?

From the Marxian standpoint there is only one conclusion, namely, that Parliament is part of the bourgeois State which stands in the way of working-class emancipation, and it follows, therefore, that during the proletarian revolution the bourgeois State machine will not be utilised but broken, and in its stead another State erected—the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Yours faithfully,

H. DIGHT.

THE SOCKS.

So far is Mr. Dight from having read Marx and Engels, that, as the above letter shows, he has not read even the work of Marx that he tries to quote from. Nor is his reading of

Lenin's pamphlet either full or clear, or he would have seen how flatly Lenin contradicts his (Dight's) attempt at a case.

Our correspondent says that we make the terms "Parliament" and "Power" synonymous. Had he read our Declaration of Principles and articles in the Socialist Standard, he would have seen that we stated that Power is dependent upon the control of the political machinery and that Parliament is the central organ of that machinery. Hence to obtain Power, control of the political machinery is absolutely essential. How Lenin agrees with this fact is shown in the pamphlet Mr. Dight mentions—"The State and Revolution." On page 29 we read:

The exploited classes need political supremacy in order completely to abolish all exploitation, i.e., in the interests of the enormous majority of the people and against the tiny minority constituted by the slave-owners of modern times—the landlords and the capitalists.

On page 30 Lenin says:

The proletariat needs the State, the centralised organisation of force and violence, both for the purpose of crushing the resistance of the exploiters and for the purpose of guiding the great mass of the population—the peasantry, the lower middle class, the semi-proletariat—in the work of economic Socialist reconstruction.

On page 33 it is stated that the general lessons of history set out in the "Communist Manifesto":

bring us to the necessary conclusion that the proletariat cannot overthrow the capitalist class without, as a preliminary step, winning political power, without obtaining political supremacy.

When Mr. Dight has read Lenin's pamphlet that he quotes from he might compare the above statements with Clauses 6 and 7 of our Declaration of Principles.

Mr. Dight's great point of what he fancies is opposition to our policy is the statement from Marx's "Civil War in France" that the working class cannot "simply lay hold of the ready made machinery of State and wield it for its own purposes."

As Mr. Dight has not read this work he is unaware that the context of that sentence totally contradicts the interpretation he tries to put upon it. The sentence is taken from section III., which opens as follows:

On the dawn of the 18th of March Paris arose to the thunder burst of "Vive la Commune." What is the Commune, that Sphinx so tantalizing to the bourgeois mind?

"The proletarians of Paris" said the Central Committee in its Manifesto of the 18th March, "amidst the failures and treasuries of the ruling classes, have understood that the hour has struck for them to save the situation by taking into their own hands the direction of affairs. . . . They have understood that it is their imperious and their

absolutist right to render themselves masters of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power." But the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready made State machinery, and wield it for its own purposes.

The centralised State power, with its ubiquitous organs of standing army, police, bureaucracy, clergy, and judicature—organs wrought after the plan of a systematic and hierarchic division of labour—originates from the days of absolute monarchy, serving nascent middle-class society as a mighty weapon in its struggles against feudalism. Still its development remained clogged by all manner of mediæval rubbish, seignorial rights, local privileges, municipal and guild monopolies and provincial constitutions. The gigantic broom of the French Revolution of the 18th century swept away all these relics of bygone times, thus clearing simultaneously the social soil of its last hindrances to the superstructure of the modern State raised under the First Empire, itself the offspring of the coalition wars of old semi-feudal Europe against modern France. During the subsequent regimes the Government, placed under parliamentary control—that is under the direct control of the propertied classes—became not only a hotbed of huge national debts and crushing taxes; with its irresistible allurements of place and pelf and patronage, it became not only the bone of contention between the rival factions and adventurers of the ruling class; but its political character changed simultaneously with the economic changes of society. At the same pace at which the progress of modern industry developed, widened, intensified, the class antagonism between capital and labour, the State power assumed more and more the character of the national power of capital over labour, of a public force organised for social enslavement, of an engine of class despotism.

I have given this long quotation from the "Civil War in France" to show how Marx has been misrepresented by the use of a phrase torn out of its context, and to show what Marx himself meant when using the phrase. Here, as even a "Communist" might have understood had he read the work, Marx is referring to the workers' position after they have seized this power.

It is when Mr. Dight attempts to quote Marx on the functions of the Commune that he shows conclusively that he has never read Marx's work. Mr. Dight says:

Marx wrote referring to the Commune that 'the Commune was to have been not a Parliamentary but a working corporation,' and in the same passage he derides the Parliamentary corporation by comparing how the "working corporation" operated, "instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to 'represent' and repress the people in parliament."

It is true that the two phrases quoted above are given by Lenin (p. 47), with other matter, in one paragraph between quotation marks, thus misleading the reader not acquainted with the original into believing that Marx put it in that form. Actually the first phrase occurs in the seventh paragraph of section III., while the

second one appears in the tenth paragraph of the same section. Moreover, although Lenin gives the full sentence containing the first phrase, Mr. Dight only quotes a part of it. Why? Because the second part, though only consisting of seven words, destroys the interpretation he tries to place upon the phrase he quotes. The full sentence is: "The Commune was to be a working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the same time." (Italics mine.)

The words italicised show clearly that the Commune was to perform parliamentary as well as the other duties imposed upon it.

Paragraph ten of section III. details the work of the rural Communes and contains the following important sentence:

The few but important functions which would still remain for a central government were not to be suppressed, as has been intentionally misstated, but were to be discharged by Communal and therefore strictly responsible agents.

while further on occurs the phrase Mr. Dight tries to use against our case:

Instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to represent the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people, constituted in Communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for workmen and managers in his business.

How the quotation from the twelfth paragraph, describing the Commune as "the political form, at last discovered," etc., helps Mr. Dight, who is opposed to political action and policy, I fail to see.

His statement that it is "a historic fact that there can be no such thing as a constitutional social revolution" merely exposes his ignorance of even modern history, for Japan carried through "a constitutional social revolution" in 1871 when feudalism was abolished.

The nonsense chattered by the "Communists" against "constitutional" action is flatly contradicted by Lenin's own words and actions. It was only by "constitutional" action that the Bolsheviks obtained control of the Duma and carried through their revolution, while on page 27 of Lenin's pamphlet "The Proletarian Revolution," where he refers to the people who control parliaments he says:

This, of course, does not mean that bourgeois parliamentarism ought not to be made use of; the Bolsheviks, for instance, made perhaps more successful use of it than any other party in the world, having in 1912-14 captured the entire Labour representation in the fourth Duma.

Crushing as this statement is against his own followers, it is surpassed by the views of one who Lenin himself would admit was far greater than any Russian Communist:

Continued on page 24.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.**• BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 74 Murdoch-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham. Branch meets Sat. at Coffee House, Spicall-st.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Com'tee. Applications to General Secy.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 147 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142 Bulwar-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Weds, Working Mens Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., J. Gallagher, 10 Sydney-st., Hanley, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., T. Hall, 48 Mayfield Grove, Gorton, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Exmouth-St. Schools (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High-rd., Willesden-green, N.W.10.

SOUTHEAST-ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy, J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Secy., 62 Haverhill-rd., Balham, S.W.12. Branch meets Fridays at 143 Beechcroft-rd., Upper Tooting at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Secy. C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mares-rd., N.22.

**S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS
LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Parliament Hill Fields, 11 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m. Garrett Lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.
Battersea, Mossbury Rd., Lavender Hill, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junc. Clyde Rd., & Phillip Ln., 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 158 High St

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 195 Vol. 17.]

LONDON, NOV., 1920.

[MONTHLY, TWO PENCE]

A GREAT CONTRADICTION

CA'CANNY A CAPITALIST NECESSITY.

It has become quite a fashion with capitalist speakers and writers on social subjects to wind up their perorations with demands or appeals for greater production. Now, if production in any industry, or in all industries, has fallen off, it must be due to one of two causes. Either the individual worker produces less, or fewer workers are engaged in production. In either case it is quite clear that, from a purely material point of view, a lower production is due to reduced expenditure of energy by the workers.

The Cause of Confusion.

The working class is composed of people who work. The capitalist class do not work, therefore the workers doing less work is the cause of reduced output.

If this question were confined to the material point of view alone, everything would be clear, and those who do not work at all would be held responsible for the shortage, especially when it was noted that they consumed the largest share of the wealth produced.

In a colony of ants or a hive of bees there is nothing to confuse the material point of view. There the relations are between ants or bees and nature. Social relations are simple, and are not confused by questions of ownership, exchange, and so on. All the members of the colony, or hive, take part in the necessary labour and share according to their needs. In human society, however, things are not so simple—private or class ownership of wealth transforms relations that should be clear into a veritable pandemonium of conflicting interests.

Working a Stunt.

Every capitalist newspaper and magazine contains articles deploring the shortage of commodities and blaming the workers for it. When the workers in any industry determine to strike for higher wages because rising

prices compel them to do so, a howl of protest goes up because output will be reduced. In short, the word has gone round for the reduced output stunt to be worked for all it is worth, with the result that one fine morning we read in every capitalist paper, side by side with the customary lecture on increased production, accounts of numbers of factories closing down and thousands of workers unemployed. Even then the prostitute writers and speakers of the capitalist Press make frantic efforts to blame the workers for the falling off in trade. Trade is bad, they say, because the capitalists cannot afford to pay the high wages prevailing, or because the workers deliberately work at a slower pace.

Capitalist Ca'canny.

Now, the power of the workers to go slow or hold up production is almost negligible. Their need for wages, and the fact that there are always more workers than jobs, throws them into competition with one another and compels them to work at top speed. In any case they must work to live.

But not so the capitalists, who never work, and yet are the last to suffer when production is impeded. Moreover, it is often to the interest of capitalists that production should be slowed up and they never hesitate to use the power they possess in that direction—a power that is far greater than the workers possess, because they (the capitalists) own and control the means of wealth-production.

In the long and futile wrangle that preceded the coal strike, the miners, who evicently knew what they were talking about, in this respect at least, accused the companies of refraining from working the best seams, reserving them for the time when Government control was removed.

During the last few weeks newspapers have

quoted numerous instances of factories in a large number of industries, curtailing production by working shorter time. Not long ago we read about milk poured down drains and fish flung back into the sea or allowed to rot, to be then sold for manure.

The Proper Thing to do.

In all such cases it seems to be taken for granted that the stoppage of production, or the deliberate waste of wealth, is the only possible thing to do in the circumstances. No one questions, for instance, that in the case of tea anything other should be done than is done by the tea-growing associations, that is, circularising all growers to reduce their output 20 per cent. With a surplus stock of 120 million pounds it is absurd that anyone should go short of tea. It is absurd, too, that any other question than the satisfaction of human needs should be considered, yet in reality this question is not considered at all. The whole question whether production shall go on or not depends entirely on whether it is profitable to some capitalist or capitalist company.

A member of the Ceylon Tea Growers' Association says that "their action (limiting output) is an attempt to save the companies from being wiped out, for it is obvious that production cannot be continued at a loss." Carried to its logical conclusion this means that if production ceases to provide profits for the capitalist class the human race must perish.

Who Produce the Wealth?

Everybody knows that the 'cute business man pretends to be running his business at a loss. The industrial capitalists (especially the small fish) are often between the devil and the deep sea when they try to square accounts with the money-lender and the landlord. But this squaring process always takes place after the workers have produced the wealth. It could not possibly take place before, because there would be nothing to share. The companies do not produce the tea, neither do the money-lenders nor the landlords. Nor do they contribute anything, either in the shape of labour (mental or manual) or material toward its production. The things they own—land, money, machinery, etc.—are either nature-given, or the result of working-class energy applied to what is nature-given.

Why, then, should the existence of companies be considered at all? If they perform no useful function they would not be missed if they were all wiped out, and the workers of the world produced the tea—and all the other things they need—in the quantities they require and according to a settled plan. It would, of

course, be galling to the capitalists to be forced to realise that production goes on to-day without assistance from them, and that there is no excuse for their existence as a separate class; but it would be still more galling to know that the workers had discovered it, and were organising to act upon the knowledge.

Besides being a useless class, the capitalist class consumes twice the quantity of wealth consumed by the working class. A writer in the "Sunday Pictorial," Mr. Lovat Fraser, says that if the wealth taken by the capitalist class were shared among the workers it would be no more than a drop in a bucket. This is obviously untrue, because the workers would then share the whole product, which is three times greater than their total wages.

Capitalists MUST Curtail Production.

But the wealth taken by the capitalists, either as rent, interest, or profit, is produced by the workers. It is evident, therefore, that the capitalist system is a system whereby the workers are robbed of the major portion of the wealth they produce by an idle class; but this is not all. The system which enables this robbery to take place is so arranged that production cannot go beyond a certain point without causing the rate of profit obtained by the capitalists to fall, so that they are forced to curtail production in their own interests.

What can be said in favour of such a system?

An idle class takes two-thirds of the wealth produced by the workers, and then stops production, not only before the needs of the workers are satisfied, but by that very act of stoppage condemning the workers in ever-increasing numbers to unemployment and starvation.

The Crux of the Matter.

Meanwhile a swarm of mercenary intellectuals continue to shriek for greater output from those who remain in employment, exhorting them, all the time, to economise in order that wages can be reduced. These are the fruits of a system based on class ownership of the means of life. Unemployment side by side with a shortage of the necessities of life; millions of willing workers in all capitalist countries held back from the work of producing wealth, and starving meanwhile, because capitalist companies, that are not even necessary to production, will suffer a reduction in profits if the workers are allowed to carry on.

In the face of well-established and obvious facts like the foregoing Mr. Lovat Fraser has the hardihood to declare that high prices are the result of reduced output, in its turn the result of high wages, which induce leisure. It is, of course, unfortunate for this contention that

capitalists everywhere should compel workers in increasing numbers to take more leisure in the shape of unemployment. Forced leisure and diminished output is the great contradiction within the capitalist system that, when fully revealed, becomes the motive for its abolition. When Mr. Fraser, in the midst of wholesale unemployment, whines "it is not a rich world," he reveals this contradiction by the violence with which he brings the two material facts together.

A Pertinent Question.

With modern methods of production and a sane system of society, sufficient wealth could be produced to satisfy the needs of a population enormously greater than exists upon the earth at the present time. Then why stop production before those living on it to-day are satisfied? Because the world's markets can only be won by cheap commodities, says the capitalist.

Precisely; it is the capitalist need for cheap commodities with which to win markets that causes unemployment, low wages, and intensive toil. And the hardships and poverty of the workers increases as the struggle for markets becomes keener. Those who cannot keep up the pace are ruthlessly flung on one side to make room for younger men and women. Labour-saving machinery, which Mr. Robert Young, M.P., says ("Reynolds's Newspaper," 12.9.20) will solve the problem of diminished output, can only flood the markets and accelerate the process that is rapidly making the capitalist system impossible—because it will no longer satisfy the bare wants of the majority—while at the same time revealing unlimited possibilities in the direction of wealth production.

The Remedy Revealed.

To reconcile this great contradiction society must be established on a basis where the means of wealth production are owned in common and democratically controlled. Then the production and distribution of all kinds of wealth can be arranged according to the needs of the people themselves.

But these two systems are opposed to each other; and the conflicting principles of the two systems are represented by the conflicting interests of the two classes in society to-day. The conflict is between the class that owns and controls and the class that is dispossessed. The antagonism is revealed in the continual struggle over wages.

Working-class interests conflict with capitalist interests at every point, and the bitterness between the two classes increases as the struggle becomes more severe and the workers

recognise its nature. Manifesting itself on the industrial field, the class struggle can only be ended on the political field, by the organised workers gaining control of the political machine, and using the armed forces and the machinery of the State to clear the way for the establishment of Socialism. F. F.

COMMODITY STRUGGLE OR CLASS STRUGGLE?

There is an old view still floating about that only those workers who are class-conscious and organised politically for the overthrow of capitalism take part in the class struggle, and that the average worker, who is not class-conscious, takes no part in the struggle, being simply a commodity seller.

Ideas don't fall down from heaven but are drawn from the material at hand, consequently the idea of the class struggle must have been drawn from the struggle itself. In other words the class struggle must have existed before we could become conscious of it. Therefore the class unconscious must have waged the class struggle in the first place, so why cannot the class unconscious still take part in it?

Those who contend that the class struggle only exists where there are class-conscious workers, and then only between the class-conscious and the ruling class, are driven to support the absurd position that the class struggle is imposed on society, that instead of ideas being the product of material conditions, material conditions are the product of ideas—the utopian view.

In spite of contentions to the contrary, no individual with a mighty brain came on the scene possessed with the brilliant idea of imposing the class struggle on society and ordering the combatants to line up and get on with it. The combatants were there; the struggle existed; but whereas formerly it was fought blindly, now some of combatants, having a clear knowledge of the position, fight with understanding, and therefore to far better purpose.

While there is a similarity between the worker coming upon the market to sell his commodity and the average capitalist coming upon the market to sell his wares, yet there are essential differences—the differences that breed the class struggle. There are opposing interests between buyers and sellers of commodities—sectional interests—but there is a class cleavage between buyers and sellers of the workers commodity and class interest enters the matter. It is a class commodity the worker sells, not an

ordinary commodity, and it is in his capacity as a member of the master class, as opposed to the working class, that the capitalist buys it. The workers combine among themselves to sell their commodity (labour power) as high as possible—the masters combine among themselves to buy it as low as possible. The worker cannot make a profit out of the sale of his labour-power, he can only live more or less well. The capitalist, on the other hand, buys labour-power to make a profit out of its consumption. It is out of the consumption of labour-power that all surplus wealth is derived.

The interests of the workers as sellers of labour-power and the interests of the capitalists as buyers thereof are diametrically opposed, and so are the ideas with which each class sets out. The main objective of the capitalist is buying to sell—investing capital. The main objective of the worker is selling to buy—selling his energy to obtain the wherewithall to live.

The commodity the worker sells is the basis of value, and consequently the amount of surplus value the buyers of it obtain is determined by the difference between the value of the labour-power and the value produced by the using up of that labour-power.

The value of the labour-power, however, is determined by its cost of production, which depends upon, among other things, the standard of living, social development and physical surroundings have handed down. Around the question of the standard of living a constant struggle goes on. This struggle is peculiar only to the labour-power commodity, and this peculiarity bears fruit in the form of the class struggle.

Workers and masters meet upon the market as equals only in the sense that they are both either sellers or buyers of commodities—but here the equality ends. The worker is bound to sell his commodity or starve; he can't go into a refrigerator, and it is this fact that binds the workers to a status of slavery—it is this fact that illustrates the sham nature of the "equality" of buyers and sellers so far as the labour-power commodity is concerned.

As soon as a child of the working class enters employment he takes a part, however insignificant it may be, in the class struggle. This struggle, in its early stages, is not a struggle for the overthrow of the system; nevertheless, it is a class struggle—the struggle of a class for existence. Ultimately this struggle develops into the struggle for the overthrow of the class that suppresses. In other words, the industrial struggle, the struggle to resist the encroachments of capital (the early form of the class struggle) develops of necessity into the political struggle, the struggle for the overthrow of

capitalism. It is out of actual class struggle experience that knowledge of it, and of the method with which to wage it, is obtained.

To sum the matter up:

The labour-power commodity is like all other commodities in that it is bought and sold upon the market, its value being determined by the cost of production, around which the higgling of the market allows its price to fluctuate.

It is unlike all other commodities in that it is the commodity of a subject class sold to a dominant class, and further in that the standard of living, an historical element, enters into the question of its cost of production.

It is these two fundamental distinctions that make the matter a class conflict as apart from the ordinary matter of the competitive buying and selling of commodities.

The modern class struggle presents two aspects. On the one side the struggle to sell labour-power under the best conditions—the industrial struggle for wages and hours of labour; on the other side the struggle for the overthrow of the wages system—the political struggle for Socialism. The un-class conscious worker takes part in the former, but only the class-conscious takes part in the latter.

The class struggle is, therefore, both industrial and political—the latter being its ultimate, its revolutionary, form. GILMAC.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

SIXTH EDITION,
WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P.,
I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions,
S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence. Post Free, Four Pence
from the S.P.G.B.
17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DIGHT SAYS THIS IS "THE KYBOSH."

TO THE EDITORS.

Dear Sirs,

Your correspondent's reply to my letter is, like the flowers that bloom in the spring, nothing to do with it. I could not for the life of me grasp what he was driving at till I came to that part of it where he says—

"How the quotation from the twelfth paragraph describing the Commune as 'the political form at last discovered,' etc., helps Mr. Dight, who is opposed to political action and policy, I fail to see."

I can only conclude that J.F. was sick when he read and replied to my letter, as I certainly do not believe that he would wilfully misrepresent, and the other alternative of stupidity on J.F.'s part is very far from being manifest. If he had read my letter carefully he would not have wasted, what must be to you, your valuable space, in replying, at such great length, to something that doesn't exist, except in his own heated imagination. If he had paid more attention to my letter he would have seen that I was NOT "opposed to political action and policy," but that I was concerned with advocating "the political form at last discovered, under which labour could work out its own economic emancipation" as opposed to your parliamentarism. To utterly ignore and dismiss the above quotation from Marx with the remark that it doesn't help me, "who is opposed to political action and policy" (J.F. says that, I don't) is on a par with the rest of his reply, namely, a shuffle.

Even though I were opposed to political action, the above quotation from Marx does not help your party, or J.F., but diametrically opposes your position, when in your Declaration of Principles you refer to "THE machinery of government" and the need for utilising "THIS machinery" as a means for achieving working-class emancipation. The British parliamentary political machine existed at the time when Marx wrote in reference to the Commune that "its true secret was this. It was essentially the government of the working class—it was the political form at last discovered, under which labour could work out its own economic emancipation." (Italics mine.) Note the words "at last discovered." For the purpose of emancipation, therefore, Marx had apparently been seeking to discover "the political form," etc., and in spite of the existing British parliamentary political machinery, "the political form" was only "at last discovered" with the advent of the Paris Commune.

Another instance in J.F.'s reply which may be cited as one in which he attempts to set up an Aunt Sally before proceeding to knock it down, is the one in which he quotes Lenin in "contradiction" to my "attempt at a case" (as if in my letter I was in any way concerned with supporting or opposing Lenin). And how does Lenin "so flatly contradict" etc. To show how J.F. quotes as follows: "The exploited classes need political supremacy in order to abolish all exploitation," etc. Seeing that I advocate this political supremacy, I fail to see how it contradicts my position. As I have already inferred, J.F. could not have read my letter with any great care, else he would have noted my statement that "during a proletarian revolution the bourgeois State machine will not be utilised but broken and in its stead another State erected—the dictatorship of the proletariat." What J.F. fails to see (among other numerous things) is that there is a vast difference between attaining to "political supremacy" and the politically unsound attempt at capturing "the machinery of government" and utilising it as "the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege." (Your Declaration of Principles.)

With reference to the charge levelled against me of having lifted a sentence from its context and so subjecting that sentence to a different interpretation than was originally intended, I am fully aware that that has been attempted by Anarchists in the past, and I have had occasion to frustrate the attempt and to point out that Marx and Engels were not "opposed to political action and policy." But then I quoted the sentence from its context in the sense that implied the existence of the context in the same way as Marx and Engels have seen fit to do, for in the preface to the "Communist Manifesto" Marx and Engels have found it quite sufficient to quote the sentence only as being all-important in itself.

I note that my letter has been given the title of "Those Misrepresentations of Marx Turn Up Again." Now I am very much concerned about "those misrepresentations," and I contend that you are the party that has been indulging in them on the one hand, and the Anarchists on the other: for, while on the one hand the Anarchists have sought to establish the claim that Marx and Engels were opposed to any political activities on the part of the workers, you, on the other hand, claim that the working class can "simply lay hold of the ready-made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes." If J.F. read my letter as he should have done, he will see it to have been an endeavour to turn those "misrepresentations" down rather than up.

How the long quotation from "The Civil

War in France" goes to show "the workers' position after they have seized this power (political supremacy) I cannot see. Nor is it very clear what is meant by "the workers' position after they have seized this power." We get an inkling, however, from another source, as instance, the statement of Gilmac in this month's SOCIALIST STANDARD. Says Gilmac:

"The statement appears before Marx's summary of the development of the State and he then goes on to show why the working class cannot wield it for its own purposes. The reason is that the State is a repressive power used against a subject class. As there will be no subject class in the new society, there will be no use for a repressive power."

The quotation by Gilmac from Engels as well as from Marx is very unfortunate for your party and supports my contention. But how does Gilmac quote Engels in support of your Declaration of Principles that the "instrument of oppression" (the State) can be "converted into the agent of emancipation"? Here is the quotation from Engels:

"From the very outset the Commune had to recognise that the working class having once obtained supremacy in the State, could not work with the old machinery of government." (Italics mine.)

And here is his quotation from Marx:

"The worker must, sometime, get the political power into his own hands in order to lay the foundations of a new organisation of labour. He must overthrow the old political system that upholds the old institutions, etc." (Italics mine.)

Marx here clearly shows my contention in my letter to have been correct, namely, that "during a proletarian revolution the bourgeois State machine will not be utilised but broken, etc. Your party is not out for the "overthrow" of the "old political system," etc., but to "convert" it "into the agent of emancipation." The position when Socialism is established is such, of course, that the State will not be needed, because of the abolition of classes, and Engels has told us that in the process of this abolition "the State will wither away." What State did Engels refer to? Did he refer to the bourgeois or the proletarian State? The Communards "overthrew the old political system" (it did not "wither away") because "they could not work with the old machinery of government," and Marx says that the workers "must overthrow the old political system." Obviously it is the proletarian State to which Engels refers—the erection of which you should advocate if you are Marxians. I said in my letter that I was opposed to your parliamentarism and in justification of this parliamentarism J.F. quotes as follows: "The Commune was to have

been a working, not a parliamentary body, executive and legislative at the same time."

Well, of course, the proletarian State will be parliamentary in the broad sense of its meaning, and so are the Russian soviets; but then I used the term in the limited sense, as you did some months ago when you had an article on "Parliament or Soviets," and when you advocated for Parliament as opposed to the other.

Referring to my statement that there can be no such thing as a constitutional social revolution J.F. says that in that way I have shown my "ignorance of even modern history, for Japan carried through a constitutional social revolution in 1871 when feudalism was abolished." I do not deny that Japan carried through a social revolution, but is J.F. sure that it was constitutional? I take it from his remarks on this point that he has read the constitution of feudal Japan and that he hasn't in any way found it in conflict with the political aspirations of the Japanese bourgeoisie of that time. If that is so, then I am astounded at J.F.'s merit in the analytical sense—or the lack of it. All I know is that it runs counter to the Marxian theory of the Materialist Conception of History. Fancy, a constitutional social revolution when "the economic structure of society is the real basis on which the juridical and political superstructure is raised, and to which definite social forms of thought correspond: in short, the mode of production determines the character of the social, political, and intellectual life generally." (Marx, "Capital.")

And again:

"In every historical epoch the prevailing mode of production and exchange, and the social organisation necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch." (Engels, second preface to the "Communist Manifesto.")

In conclusion, I am convinced that if Marx and Engels were living to-day, and providing you had any influence with the working class, they would ask to be saved from their "friends."

Apart from commenting upon the fact that I have noticed one or two minor distortions of my letter, I think I have given you enough to ponder over.

The statement by J.F. that I haven't read the works I quoted from is not true. This is the result of his knowledge that I did not quote from the actual works which I read years ago, but which I did not possess at the time of writing my letter. I note that J.F. calls his reply "The Socks." Will you kindly permit me to call this rejoinder "The Kyboosh"?

Yours faithfully, H. Dight.

THEN WHAT IS THIS?

One can easily agree with Mr. Dight when he complains that he does not understand my reply to his first letter. The lack of understanding is certainly not limited to that reply. It extends to Marx's writings, and even to several of his (Mr. Dight's) own statements.

When a correspondent misquotes, misinterprets, and opposes the works of an author he claims to agree with, there are two explanations possible of his action. One is that he has not read that author, the other is that he is deliberately misquoting him. I gave the long quotations from Marx to show the inaccuracy of Mr. Dight's statements, and gave the charitable interpretation that he had not read Marx. Now, while claiming that he has read Marx, he states that it "was years ago," and admits that he had not the works by him when writing, thus confirming my case. But he makes a far more important admission. In quoting from Lenin's book he had omitted certain words that I pointed out altered the whole sense of the paragraph. He now admits that he omitted those words, and then says: "Well, of course, the proletarian State will be parliamentary in the broad sense of its meaning." This latter statement not only shatters his whole position, but is another illustration of the lack of understanding referred to above.

Mr. Dight tries to contend that his first letter showed that he "was not opposed to political action and policy," and in support of this contention says he was "concerned with advocating 'the political form at last discovered under which labour could work out its own emancipation' as opposed to your parliamentarism." This is another case of failure to understand his own terms. Although I had, in my previous answer, given a short account of political and parliamentary actions, Mr. Dight makes not the slightest attempt to deal with that account, nor even to state what he means by "parliamentarism."

There are two, and only two, general methods of political action open to the working class. One is to use their political weapons to place the master class in Parliament—the citadel of power—and the other is to use those weapons to drive the master class out of that citadel. We, being Marxists, advocate the latter method.

Mr. Dight opposes this policy. But he does not advocate the former policy. Therefore the only attitude left open to him by his antagonism to our policy is opposition to political action.

Mr. Dight says that he "cannot see" how the long quotation from "The Civil War in France" says what it states. Most of our readers will

agree as to his blindness when they are reminded of a phrase in the Manifesto of the Central Committee given in the earlier part of the quotation: "They" (the proletarians of Paris) "have understood that it is in their imperious and their absolute right to render themselves masters of their own destinies, by seizing upon the governmental power." Marx gloried in their action, which is the policy laid down in our Declaration of Principles. When I said that the quotation in full showed that the much abused phrase of Marx was referring to the workers' position after this seizure Mr. Dight retorts that I am answered by Gilmac when quoting Engels in the same issue. Doubtless it surprises Mr. Dight to find two writers in such close agreement, a crime of which our writers and speakers are commonly guilty. Gilmac's quotation says: "From the very start the Commune had to recognise that the working class having once attained supremacy in the State, could not work with the old machinery of government." Here, in language simple enough for a child to understand, Marx and Engels state that the workers must first seize political power to achieve emancipation. It is as clear as daylight that before the workers can construct a State in harmony with the common ownership of the means of life, they must have reached power, must have "attained supremacy," must have "laid hold of the State machinery," must have captured Parliament. Not until they have carried out this political action can they control the armed forces and use them as the agent of emancipation to drive the capitalist class out of possession. Obviously those who oppose this policy are anti-Marxians, whether they call themselves Anarchists or Communists.

Mr. Dight asks if I found "the constitution of feudal Japan in conflict with the political aspirations of the Japanese bourgeoisie of that time." And then he says: "All I know is that it runs counter to the Marxian theory of the Materialist Conception of History." Of course, he does not know anything of the sort. His statement shows first the confusion existing in his mind, secondly the lack of knowledge of the conditions by his reference to the "political aspirations" of the Japanese bourgeoisie, and thirdly his entire ignorance of the Materialist Conception of History.

That theory points out that when economic development reaches a certain stage, a more or less rapid change must take place in the superstructure of society, but, of course, says nothing at all of the change being brought about "constitutionally," or "unconstitutionally," as, clearly, this factor depends upon the circum-

(Continued on page 46.)

port it, and they will not invite assistance from Lambury and his like, or accept it if offered. They will see to it that Socialism is presented and Socialism only, recognising that Socialists can only be made by Socialist propaganda.

D. W. F.

DON'T BE MISLED.

While attending a crowded meeting held by the Socialist Party of Great Britain in North London the other night, the writer was afforded a glimpse into the mind of a man in the audience who might be taken as representative of the ordinary type of individual.

This man showed by his manner that he was intelligent to a degree, but he also showed that his education was sadly in need of extension.

He asked the speaker (who had referred to the probability of the coming winter being a very hard and

BLACK ONE

for the workers) a question, the gist of which is as follows:

"Don't you think that, while keeping to the idea of bringing in Socialism, the workers would be well advised to agitate for reforms to mitigate the hard times that are undoubtedly in store for them this winter? Such reforms as getting the Government to give up the campaign in Mesopotamia, to resume trade relations with Russia, to start building houses on a large scale in England, which would put thousands into work, and to take full advantage of countless other ways of economising and making work for the enormous army of unemployed?"

It may also be noted here that the questioner declared that he was "in sympathy with the Socialists," in fact he was a Socialist!

Now, as men who have studied the matter from the point of view of working-class interests—and the interests of the only other class, the capitalist class, are in good enough hands—we are able to state most emphatically that agitating for reforms of

THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM

will not better the material conditions of the working class generally.

It matters not what reform the working class may agitate for or against, the final say as to whether it shall or shall not be rests with the capitalist class and their agents.

The term "capitalist agent" comprises every member of Parliament and a great many who would like to be members. Very few workers, however, have sufficient knowledge to understand that the three candidates who stood for

the constituency of Ilford at the recent bye-election were, without exception, agents of the capitalist class.

However, let us get back to this matter of reforms.

During recent years we have had some shining examples of reforms that were or

WERE NOT WANTED

by the workers being placed on the Statute Book because the capitalist class judged them expedient for their own interests. Take for example the National Health Act.

When that "rare and refreshing fruit" was dangled before the eyes of the workers by the capitalist agent, Mr. Lloyd George, it was a reform strongly objected to by the workers in general, but because it suited the interests of the capitalist class, and because, as at Ilford recently, the workers had blindly given away their power to have things otherwise, that reform went on the Statute Book.

Again, the granting of a pension to aged poor persons was a reform that the workers generally desired.

The capitalist agents examined the idea, laughed up their sleeves, and old age pensions became an accomplished fact.

And now the poor old pensioner knows that he would be better off in the workhouse. We can get what satisfaction we may out of knowing that the workhouses are practically empty (some having been sold), and that old age pensioners—who must have led "respectable" lives—cannot possibly live on the miserable pittance that reform has given them.

Old people without friends or resources did not starve in the workhouse, but now they are

COMPELLED

to do so on the terribly inadequate sums they receive, while, by way of contrast, a law-breaking criminal, a convict, according to Sir J. L. Baird, Under Secretary at the Home Office, costs the Government the sum of £111 per annum for his upkeep.

Take the latest reform that has come about, the Unemployment Insurance Act that comes into force on November 8th.

Unemployment benefit will be at the rate of 15s. weekly for men and 12s. for women—and not for more than 15 weeks in any insurance year.

According to the "Daily Chronicle" of Oct. 8th, Preston, to take only one town, had a sixth of its population out of work, and "an increasing number of firms are adopting short time and curtailing output."

Our capitalist masters have seen the possibility of serious trouble arising as a result of the terrible misery, want, and disease that will

unavoidably follow in the train of such widespread and lasting unemployment.

They know that it is easier for them to subsidise misery than to meet strife, hence the 15s. per week for the breadwinner to keep himself, his wife, and his children on, and bread costing 1s. 4d. per quarter!

AFTER 15 WEEKS WHAT?

Let the workers gravely consider these reforms, and then reflect that all the material wealth of the world is the result of the application of the workers' energy to nature-given material.

Wealth can be produced in stupendous abundance by the workers, but that production is limited by its profit-extracting possibilities for the capitalist class. When the capitalist sees no chance of disposing of the articles that his employees have produced, for a substantial profit, he curtails production or closes down his works altogether.

To-day the warehouses of the world are filled to overflowing with the goods necessary to life. The capitalists cannot dispose of them; the workers are forbidden by capitalists' property-protecting laws to take what they are so much in need of, although there is plenty for all.

And the worker, in his profound ignorance and general apathy toward these problems that concern him so vitally, is content to starve, or at best to agitate for reforms!

The wonderful knowledge attained up till now by human beings is not sufficient to prevent the vast majority of them being in danger throughout their lives of starving in the midst of plenty—of the plenty created by themselves.

This vicious system that we live under has not always been, and it need not continue. But before it can be superseded by Socialism, which is a system of society based upon the common ownership of the means of life, Socialism must be understood and desired by the workers generally.

To agitate for the reform of a system which has such a basis as the capitalist system has, to endeavour to palliate its inevitably harsh bearing upon those who possess nothing, is a waste of energy and time.

Worse than that, the struggle for reform obscures the main issue.

One thing, and one thing only, will change for the better the condition of the workers generally, and that is the

OVERTHROW OF CAPITALISM

and its supersession by Socialism.

Our friend the questioner, although declaring himself to be a Socialist, proved beyond doubt that he did not understand what Socialism

means, and consequently he could not be a Socialist.

He is not alone, however, in labouring under a multitude of disarranged ideas. There are many unfortunately like him who do not understand what Socialism means but who are always ready to assert that they are Socialists.

There are also a great many who, while thoroughly understanding the Socialist position, are satisfied to improve their own position at the expense of the workers whom they mislead—men who make a good fat living out of wearing out the workers' energy and obscuring their understanding by leading them in strivings for reform that, at best, only prolong the life of a system that makes the existence of the worker a long-drawn-out terror.

Some of these paid misleaders of men have actually enough subtlety and bare-faced villainy about them to call themselves Socialists.

This refers to such agents of the capitalist class as the apostles of reform who, a short time ago were strenuously advising the workers to

PRODUCE MORE

with the result that is plain for any poor fool to see to-day, when, as the consequence of having "produced more" than our capitalist masters can find a ready market for, the workers are unemployed and unable to obtain the things they need to keep themselves alive.

The abolition of capitalism and the inception of Socialism is a work that necessitates knowledge of the system now obtaining, of the system that can replace it, and of the necessary work that shall make Socialism an accomplished fact.

To gain this knowledge the workers must think for themselves!

Socialism will not come until it is generally understood and desired.

Organisation will give knowledge an effectiveness that will sweep want and poverty from the earth.

Such an organisation is to your hand in the Socialist Party of Great Britain.

Your lot to-day is insecurity of life, misery, degradation and want, but if you will have it.

S.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

"KNOWLEDGE IS POWER."

Economic Class at Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. (off Farringdon Road) on Thursdays at 8 p.m. Try to attend.

CORRESPONDENCE. (Continued from page 39.)

stances prevailing at the time. In accordance with the powers given them by the constitution, the ruling class in Japan (partly capitalist partly feudal) carried through a social revolution. All Mr. Dight's "fancies" cannot touch these facts. Another illustration of what can be done "constitutionally" occurred in this country in 1914. When war broke out the Parliament—the central organ of Political Power—wiped out the whole legal basis of Private Property and Personal Right by giving the Government power to take any property and any person it desired under the notorious Defence of the Realm Acts. And this was quite "constitutional" and not in the least "Fancy," as so many found to their cost.

There is one other inaccuracy. Mr. Dight wishes to call his rejoinder "The Kybosh." Its proper title would be "The Boomerang."

J. F.

AN INTERESTING LETTER FROM A READER.

To THE EDITOR.

Dear Sirs,—The article "Paradox or Illusion" which appeared in your July issue should be read by all who desire their minds cleared of the bunkum served up by the daily Press.

The vicious reasoning that leads to a "vicious circle" conclusion is effectively dealt with. Therefore it surprised me not a little to find a discordant in the person of "Bannocho," whose contribution appeared in last month's issue.

Our friend assumes, apparently, that as the market price of gold is above the mint price, the law upon which your conclusions are based is inoperative.

Is it not probable that this unusual phenomenon of gold premium is due to the chaotic state of the foreign exchanges, and not to an excessive issue of paper money, and that the sum total of prices still determine the sum total of money and not vice versa?

A perusal of the metal market quotations shows that the price of gold varies inversely with the exchange rate for American dollars. The Government is redeeming a portion of the debt contracted during the war. The usual method adopted in the repayment of foreign loans is the cancellation of "bills" purchased from the exporters of goods to the creditor country. "Bills" are, however, at a premium, and it may be more economical to purchase gold and export it than to purchase "bills," which,

incidentally, by reducing the number available for importers, would tend to depreciate the rate of exchange still further.

No private individual is allowed to draw sovereigns from the Bank for export, but he may purchase gold bullion. Consequently the keen competition for gold to evade the necessity of buying "bills" forces the price of gold to a premium.

And now for the point at issue:

Every "bill" endorsed is a promise to pay in gold.

It matters not the method, or the expense incurred in the process. The question of premiums and discounts is, strictly speaking, a domestic one.

Goods have had their values expressed in terms of gold, and equal quantities of gold have equal value, nothing more or less.

Yours faithfully, Wm. NICHOLLS.

OUR COMMENT.

Mr. Nicholls's views are correct, as is easily seen when one calls to mind the large number of countries that are in debt owing to the war. This means that not only here, but in every country in Europe, there is a scramble for gold either to meet the interest on this debt or to pay balances for goods received. As the gold is, obviously, not paid for by gold, but by goods or credit, it simply means that more goods, or more credit, is being offered for the gold to-day. Hence its "price"—a term causing great confusion in the minds of people at the moment, is higher than before.—Ed. Com.

TALES OF A TRAVELLER.

Comrade Editors,

Reverting to some remarks made by F. F. in the July "S.S." in his article "Paradox or Illusion," I am tempted to offer a few myself in view of the fact that further argument was indulged in in the September issue.

In the first case I would state emphatically that the £1 Bradbury note does not represent the value of the sovereign, despite the fact that one is able to exchange notes for gold if one cares to pay a visit to the Bank of England.

I may say in this connection that it is necessary to be very sparing in one's demands for such exchange, otherwise the Bank will be sufficiently curious as to one's motives to set the "splits" moving to ascertain them, and a case recently tried in the courts showed what severe penalties are visited upon those who attempt to realise the difference in value contained in a sovereign and a £1 Bradbury, and this difference is sufficiently tempting for folk out on the make to risk these penalties in their endeavour to obtain it.

I was in France a few months since, and whilst exchanging English paper money for French asked what difference would be allowed for gold, and I can state categorically that in every case the offer was between 25 and 30 per cent. higher. Previously to this I was in Egypt, where I found 31s. was the price; about the same period in India the figure ranged, in various districts, between 32s. and 45s., and while in the Strait Settlements the price was not so high, it was quite easy to obtain as much as 33s. to 35s. In China the same conditions prevailed in a lesser degree owing to the fact that less English money was available and the cost of forwarding the gold to the place of demand had to be taken into account.

I quote the above from actual experience, not from hearsay, and may say a thriving business is being done all the time in this realisation of the difference between the value contained in a gold sovereign and that alleged to be represented in a £1 note. In fact, if F.F. cares to try it, I could prove to him that he could pay first class travelling expenses and live like a duke on the proceeds of the sale of gold sovereigns in the right quarters, if he can be assured assured of obtaining a sufficient supply of the coin under discussion. But there's the rub! I would emphasise that in all the cases I have quoted the exchange is offered in English paper currency.

To conclude, I would enquire, does F.F. maintain that despite the rise in price of other commodities that of gold remains unchanged?

D. W. F.

My critic states "most emphatically that the £1 Bradbury note does not represent the value of the sovereign, despite the fact that one is able to exchange notes for gold if one cares to pay a visit to the Bank of England." But he completely fails to show why they are so exchangeable if the note does not represent the sovereign. The fact that they are exchangeable is surely sufficient to prove that the £1 note is backed by the sovereign, and, therefore, that the latter's value is fully represented by the note. Unless it can be proved that the two are not exchangeable it is idle to assert that they are not equivalents. Only those things containing or representing value in equal amounts are exchangeable in the capitalist world.

The reference by D.W.F. to the "folk on the make" who demand sovereigns for notes has no bearing on the question, although as I pointed out in my reply to Mr. Bannocho, the fact that it is illegal to melt down sovereigns and unpatriotic to demand them, together with the knowledge that the gold is there if wanted, fully explains why it is not demanded.

All the cases D.W.F. cites of the difference allowed for gold when exchanging English for foreign money has nothing to do with the subject. Gold in the form of bullion is international money, and exchanges at its value everywhere. Where the rate of exchange between countries varies, the difference between credit notes and gold will vary in the same direction. The difference in the rate of exchange quoted by D.W.F. represents largely the state of government and other credits of those countries.

A paper currency convertible into the standard metal on demand can no more be inflated than a metal currency in which every coin contains its actual worth in that metal. If the Government in pre-war days had minted more sovereigns than were necessary for the exchange of commodities, all the sovereigns over and above those necessary would simply have lain idle at the Bank.

And exactly the same thing happens where gold is represented by notes that are convertible on demand.

In the business arena of the country the note will buy the same amount of commodities as the sovereign, and is treated with the same respect. Whether debts are paid in gold or paper the same amount must be handed over in £ s. d., and no discount or reduction is made for payment in either medium. Obviously, then, for all business purposes, for the transaction of all exchanges within the country the £1 note represents the sovereign.

The question with which D.W.F. concludes his letter does not affect the above conclusions. It would be just as absurd to deny that the price of gold had risen as it is to deny that the £1 note represents the sovereign. Those who claim that the inflation of currency is the cause of high prices can only establish their claim by explaining how it is possible to inflate a convertible currency. F. F.

OUR £1,000 FUND.

Christmas is coming, and so a word about our Thousand pound fund will be a word in season. Important changes in regard to our Party Organ are now occupying our attention, and an influx of money to that fund would go a long way to clear the atmosphere. Send us along a shilling or two before you get the sack and haven't any to send. It will comfort you to think that when you could you had a cut at your tormentors. Do it now!

PRESSURE VALVES.

What is meant by the term "pressure valves" needs no explanation: the majority of men know their use in these days of highly developed machinery. Therefore it is not the present writer's intention to pen an article on valves as applied to mechanical devices, but to point the accusing finger at the human valves who appear in the form of Labour and trade union officials screwed rather tight upon the working-class ignorance.

At present we see these valves working vigorously, proof of the high pressure in the working-class boiler, which in its turn results from the still higher pressure put upon the working class by modern capitalist methods of production.

We have had many opportunities—and the future holds a good many more—to witness how the labour-leading charlatans adapt themselves as valves to relieve labour pressure and work only for the maintenance of the master class, sure, if something unpleasant happens for the master class, that the labour wheelers must not be blamed.

For instance, analyse the attitude of the coal miners' leaders. Their alarm whistle has torn the air for four weeks to inform the master class that something unpleasant would happen if the high labour pressure was not relieved. Whenever they sound the alarm they take great pains to show the master class how to artificially relieve pressure in order that the old engine—which takes everything worth having and returns nothing worth keeping to the working class—may be kept going.

This artificial relief, you will have guessed, takes in all cases the form of wage adjustment to accord with the increased cost of living, but as you will have already observed, even the most generous (!) adjustment never puts the workers much above the poverty line.

There are many who are familiar with all manner of mechanical devices, mostly ardent T.U. men, walking alongside closed factories with nothing to do and next to nothing to eat. They were told by their leaders and other capitalist agents to produce more in order to save "their" country from ruin. They produced more, with the result that, whatever they have done for "their" country, they have put themselves on the starvation list.

Why don't they study our warnings given month after month? Why don't they seriously investigate? Why don't they use their brain power in the right manner? They soon would realise the uselessness of following leaders who work hand in hand with the very class they ought to fight to the bitter end if they honestly

wished to serve, and not to help dominate, the working class.

Do these ever-increasing masses of unemployed study the law of cause and effect? They certainly suffer the effects of the capitalist system.

The S.P.G.B. is open to them if they are desirous of obtaining a thorough knowledge of the cause of their suffering and of the means whereby we shall rid the world of a system which causes such suffering.

A. DRUMMER.

DON'T BE MISLED.

Fellow Worker,

YOU ARE VICTORIOUS!

YOU have won the war. **YOU** have won the peace. **YOU** have won the General Election. **YOU** have won the lockouts, the strikes, the disease, the hospitals, lunatic asylums, and the workhouses.

YOU have won **CAPITALISM!**

Yours alone is the credit; you alone are to be praised.

You have followed your leaders' advice and worked harder, and now master's warehouses are chock full with commodities. You have glutted the world with wealth. Factories are closing down; "hands" are being discharged wholesale. The markets will not absorb the wealth produced. **YOURS** is the credit.

You **VOTED** for capitalism. You **SUPPORT** capitalism. You **WANT** capitalism.

Women and children are taking your jobs. Your women are being forced on the streets. And the pawnbroker will only advance ninepence on the "Services Rendered" badge.

YOURS is the credit.

You have returned your masters to Parliament. Again have you given them the right to exploit you, your wives and kiddies, to declare dividends on the wounds and scars of "heroes," to burn, maim, poison and destroy for profit.

Like sheep you have followed and follow "leaders," who knowingly lead you into the wilderness of Direct Action and anarchy, a wilderness that bristles with bayonets and machine guns, and where the only "manna" you are likely to receive will be in the shape of bombs from Handley-Page, made in nationalised factories, where shop stewards see to it that trade union conditions are carried out.

You voted for the Co-Op Labour man, for the Coalitionist, for the Bib Lab—any old freak who would do his best to perpetuate capitalism. You voted for the capitalists' profits, and your own "right" to work or starve, to work AND starve, to idle and starve.

You have been of every shade of opinion, Christian, Atheist, Tory, Liberal, Labour—any and every thing.

BECOME INTELLIGENT. Study your position in society. Learn that the present system is based upon the private ownership of the means and instruments of wealth production and distribution; that there are two classes in society, the possessing class and the working class—**YOUR** class.

Discover that because you are denied access to the means of life you are a commodity, bought and sold just like tomatoes and tripe. Then you will know that the only salvation for you will be the establishment of a system of society in which the whole people commonly own and control their means of wealth production and distribution.

When you have progressed so far **JOIN THE ARMY.**

Not an army to fight capitalist quarrels over trade routes and markets, but the army of revolutionary workers organised in the Socialist Party of Great Britain, with the object of capturing political power, in order to abolish capitalism and establish Socialism. A. H.

"MIDDLE-CLASS"

RESPECTABILITY.

One hears a good deal about that portion of society yclept the "middle class." In reality the successive class struggles throughout history have wiped out all but two classes, viz, the capitalist class and the working class; but apparently the title "middle class" is still given to those unfortunates (or fortunates as the case may be) who wallow not in luxury or in mud! Their main function seems to be to keep up the moral tone of mankind and save for humanity its chiefest virtue, Respectability.

To the discerning Socialist the capitalist system is, most of it, naked rottenness, while the rest of it is covered by a thin veneer that only accentuates the filth beneath. The working class, it would seem, do not notice the rottenness, but are deceived by the veneer. This veneer manifests itself in a variety of ways, in conventional respectability, religious and military ceremonies, persiflage, and, above all, in treating as "taboo" the ugly truth!

The shibboleth of the "middle class" is "respectability." It believes itself, on that account, as distinct from and above the working class as the dwellers upon high Olympus are from and above the cowherds of the plains below. It calls its ugly little villa "The Lindens," and marries its daughters respectably, whereas the working class lives in a tenement

and very often does not marry its daughters at all, and therein lies the difference.

But when the Socialist comes along and points out that both portions are alike inasmuch as they are equally exploited and robbed by the capitalist class, what a raising of hands and eyebrows there is, what a fluttering in the dovescotes of Suburbia! But it is nevertheless true that the so-called middle-class man is as fearful and afraid for his economic position as any member of society who is forced to sell his power to labour in order to live.

To a very large extent capitalism thrives on this self-deception of the "salaried." Most of the apologists of the system spring from this section of the working class. And though some of its opponents are of the "middle class," they have met with their most bitter opposition in its ranks. For why?

The "middle class" knows that slums exist; it also knows that people starve to death occasionally. It will admit, when its young people are out of the room, that prostitutes abound in large numbers in great cities; that venereal diseases fill hospitals. But then, you know, it is not usual to talk of such things—it is not respectable!

I once asked some young men of this "middle class" at the beginning of the recent war, why it was they rushed to avenge the outraged women of Belgium yet observed without indignation thousands of women forced to sell their bodies on the streets to avoid starvation. I think their answer was to call me a pro-German! To them and their section fighting Germans was the proper thing to do. But to think why they should or should not never occurred to them.

It is not to be wondered at that the capitalist Press, particularly during a strike, keeps the "middle class" distinct from the rest of the community. But as Marx has pointed out, this section of society is gradually being brought face to face with its true position in relation to the rest of society, and the time is not far distant when "respectability" will have ceased to be a stumbling block in the path of progressive thought. We read now-a-days of unions for the protection of clergymen, bank clerks, doctors, and others who, perhaps unwillingly enough, are beginning to see that so far as the capitalist system is concerned, there is not an atom of difference between the man with a pen or lancet and the miner or road-mender.

But they should bear this in mind and act upon it too: Capitalism can do nothing for them. There is one remedy only for the evils and discomforts they are up against, and that is the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of Socialism. S. H. S.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthev-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 15 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 74 Murdock-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham. Branch meets Sat. at Coffee House, Spicel-st.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Com.tee. Applications to General Secy.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142 Bulwar-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Sta.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Weds. Working Mens Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., J. Gallagher, 10 Saffrey-st., Hanley, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., T. Hall, 48 Mayfield Grove, Gorton, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Exmouth-St. Schools (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High-rd., Willesden-green, N.W.10.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy, J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliff-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Secy., 62 Haverhill-rd., Balham, S.W.13. Branch meets Fridays at 143 Beechcroft-rd., Upper Tooting at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Secy. C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mares-rd., N.22.

**S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS
LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Parliament Hill Fields, 11 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m. Garrett Lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.
Battersea, Mossbury Rd., Lavender Hill, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junc. Clyde Rd., & Phillip Ln., 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 8 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING 156 High St.

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments of production and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as is the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

No. 196. Vol. 17.]

LONDON, DEC., 1920.

[MONTHLY, TWO PENCE

A PLASTER FOR A WOODEN LEG.

"THE THREEFOLD STATE. The True Aspect of the Social Question." By Dr. RUDOLPH STEINER. London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 5s. net.

The Adaptability of Capitalism.

Capitalism is a wonderful system of society. Its powers of production are colossal: its products more amazing than any dream of the Arabian Nights. Huge structures, mighty engines, gigantic ships, tremendous means of transport, mark its march across the earth. But along with the giant powers and products exist problems of such seeming complexity, and so far-reaching in their effects, that all the spokesmen, defenders, apologists, and believers in the system are bewildered at the appalling appearance of these problems, and vainly seek a solution within the limits of the system.

Their failure to find such a solution raises the hopes of those who, with fiery enthusiasm taking the place of knowledge, look to the overthrow of capitalism as a result of the insolubility of these problems, in the immediate future.

Capitalism, however, has shown remarkable powers of recovery from shocks, and it is easy to overestimate the speed at which it may succumb to its own contradictions.

The world war lasting over four years was a terrific strain upon its powers; yet it not only supported millions of men as combatants, but supplied stupendous quantities of materials of a solely destructive character in addition to maintaining both the combatants and the producers.

The Strain of "Peace."

If, however, it stood the shock of a mighty war tolerably well, it is sustaining the shock of partial peace badly. The inherent contradictions of the system come to the front with

greater force because the war pushed forward mechanical and scientific developments in industry as a hothouse develops the growth of a plant. As a result of this development the problems inevitably bound up with capitalism loom larger, show sharper, and press harder than before.

Pannicky "Intellectuals."

Apologists and defenders of capitalism are growing uneasy, and even alarmed, at the menacing aspects of these problems. The bolder of them seek for some reorganisation of the system that, while it leaves the capitalists secure, will palliate the evils existing. In this evils existing. In this country perhaps the chief example of this idea is Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb's "Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth."

It is claimed that on the Continent the chief work on this subject is Dr. Rudolph Steiner's "Threefold State." The collapse of Austria as a result of the war, and the appalling condition of Eastern Europe generally, have shown the evils and dangers of the present situation more clearly there than they appear here. Under such conditions the primary need for food places all else in a secondary position. Hence the professional sections find themselves pushed into the background and in danger of being submerged in the chaos.

Sounding the Alarm.

This book, with its threefold State as a solution for the evils of capitalism, is a vivid expression of the professional's attempt to restore order out of confusion.

The author first draws attention to the attitude of the working class. He warns the master class that the workers have become "class-conscious," are students of Marx, and are developing a scientific mode of thought.

He claims "that the most powerful driving force in the world of labour is the system of thought," and says that it is to some extent the first of its kind in the world to take its stand solely on a scientific basis." (P. 34.)

According to him the great evil of the present system is not that it robs the workers of the material wealth they have produced, though the fact of the robbery is admitted, but—

It is because machinery and capitalism could give the working man nothing to fill and satisfy his soul as a human being that the working class movement was driven to seek for its fount of inspiration in the direction of modern science. (P. 12.)

What the Workers Want.

It is true that the worker is not really conscious of this "soul aspiration" and if asked would deny it, claiming that what is required is freedom from exploitation; but our author denies that such freedom alone would solve the problem, and on page 34 asks:

Suppose we find anywhere signs that there is a life of the soul having its source in the spirit of the times, bearing mankind up and down with it as it goes, and rooted in a spiritual reality, then from this soul life may come the force which shall give the right impulse to the social movement also.

and on page 87 he says that—

in the domain of mind and spirit there reigns a reality that transcends material external circumstances and bears within itself its own matter and substance.

Meaningless jargon of this sort prepares the reader for the author's remedies. According to him human societies should function in three independent but connected channels. He admits that to-day the economic factor pervades—nay overrides—all other activities in society but this he holds is one of the great causes of the growing chaos. Mankind has three sides to its character, and the State should be reformed in harmony with these characteristics.

Here is the New Utopia.

First should come the Economic State, concerned with the production, circulation and consumption of commodities.

Secondly should come the "Equity State" that deals with the common rights, the relation of man and man in social affairs.

Thirdly there is the "Spiritual State." This "must comprise all that concerns the life of the mind and spirit" or "everything that must play a part in the body social by reason of those natural aptitudes of the individual human being, whether those aptitudes be qualities of mind or body." (P. 57.)

Here we reach a world of shadow and vagueness, in fact, the only thing standing out clear and definite in this threefold State is that pri-

vate property in the means of life will still

The Equity State must not prevent the formation and control of private property in capital, so long as the connection between the capital-basis and individual ability remains such that the private control implies a service to the whole body social. (P. 131.)

Nothing New Under the Sun.

It is to be under control that is on lines curiously similar to those laid down in the British Government's new Agricultural Bill, where, having guaranteed the farmers a price for their goods, it is enacted that if a farmer does not carry on production efficiently the Government will take control of the land.

Dr. Steiner's scheme covers all branches of production, but there the Government does not take control itself, but merely hands the business on to another capitalist or group. The capitalist concerned, however, will have the right to pick out an individual or group to whom the property shall be transferred.

Under this section the worker is not to be treated as a commodity, but must have "the conditions of a decent human existence." These conditions being a question of man to man, will be arranged by the "equity State." To prevent the latter becoming contaminated by economic interests it must be rigidly excluded from any management of economic processes and must get rid of those now managed by the State, such as the Post Office, etc.

Forgotten Trifles.

Who, then, shall decide the conditions of production? The Spiritual State. This State will lay down the methods and details of the economic system, though the management will be in the hands of the Economic State.

The Spiritual State will lay down rules for guidance in Education—but not State Education. The author's ideal is to see State Education completely abolished, and all education left to private persons. Children are to have the "right to education," and the father of a family will have an income in excess of that of a single man to provide for his children's education.

The critical reader may here ask "How are these States to be formed?" the answer to which be that of Masfield's vagabond—"Dunno." Whether they are to be elected or selected, nominated or appointed, hereditary or periodical, the author does not say. It is all left in the beautiful, vague, one might almost say "spiritual" condition.

Steiner's Ignorance.

How deeply the author has gone in his examination of present conditions is shown by his statements about the "useful functions" of the capitalists, and his childish belief that the

"entrepreneur"—or "initiator" as his translator calls it—still exists in modern capitalism. He has no idea that the same factor in economic development killed both these personalities at the same time. The joint stock company wound up the "useful functions" of the capitalist and converted the initiator into a salaried servant.

A Funk Hole Book.

The book is an interesting example of the attempts of the "non-productive labourers"—as Loria calls the "intellectuals"—to produce a plan that will show the capitalists a solution to their present difficulties, while still leaving them a ruling class, and which will lead the workers on another wild-goose chase by promising them a decent existence.

How imbecile these attempts are is shown by one simple factor in the system of capitalism.

Under private ownership of the means of life goods are produced to sell. In order to sell there must be buyers—that is, people able to purchase. Mere desire for, or even pressing need for, the goods is not sufficient. One must be able to produce the cash. The market will thus be determined by the number of buyers multiplied by their purchasing power. Every student of economic development knows that the methods of production have improved and increased by leaps and bounds until the products have gone far beyond both the increase of buyers and their purchasing power. To meet this situation one of two courses must be followed.

Dubious Alternatives.

Either the workers must have their hours of work reduced until, even with increased means of production, only the amount of commodities required by the market is produced, or a sufficient number of workers must be thrown out of work to allow the remainder to stay at production to turn out the goods required.

The capitalists, of course, have not the slightest intention of adopting the first method. The second is in full swing now, though modified by a few doles.

The idiotic paradox of millions of producers being in want because they have produced so lavishly that their products are piled all around them will not be abolished by patching up administration. The evil is rooted in the private ownership of the means of life, and cannot be cured until that ownership is abolished.

Fabian quackeries and Austrian paper lids on volcanoes are equally ineffective. The only remedy is for the workers to capture political power and use it to abolish capitalism root and branch.

J. F.

A BRIEF EXPOSITION OF SOCIALIST THEORY.

VALUE.

We propose now to briefly epitomise the Socialist theory of Value, which is exhaustively and scientifically worked out by Karl Marx in "Capital."

We have already pointed out that a knowledge of what constitutes the wealth of a given period, and the method by which such wealth is obtained, is necessary in order to understand the ideas prevailing at that period. Consequently, to understand the ideas of to-day, we must find out how the wealth of to-day is obtained, and of what it consists.

By the term "wealth" we do not mean air, water, happiness, misery, and so on. The wealth to which we refer is economic wealth—the result obtained by applying human energy to the material provided by nature, such as food, clothing, houses, ships—articles useful to man which require producing.

Now what is the first fact connected with the nature of the wealth of modern times that comes to our notice on examining present society? In the opening lines of "Capital" Marx plunged right into the heart of the matter. He said:

In other words the wealth of to-day appears as a multitude of useful articles for sale.

These articles that are for sale have different values—one is worth so much, another is worth more, and another, again, is worth less.

To find out the cause of the difference in value, and the substance of value itself, we must separate in imagination a single commodity from the world of commodities and analyze its relation to others, and also its origin and development.

A commodity, then, is an article for sale; but to be saleable it must contain two quite distinct properties: it must be useful and it must be valuable.

When we say that a commodity must be useful we do not mean useful to those who produce them. Commodity production is the production of articles that are useless to the producers but useful to others—the potential buyers. An article has as many uses as there are human wants it can satisfy. Its useful side is its capacity to satisfy these requirements. For example, steel is useful for moulding into a bayonet or a ploughshare; gold is useful for ornamenting a temple of peace or financing a war, and so forth. A useless article could not be a commodity, as it would be unsaleable—there would be no demand for it.

The valuable property of an article has not

thing to do with its uses. No matter how varied the uses an article can be put to its value is not increased by a fraction. No matter how useful or essential an article may be to humanity its value is not in the least affected. For example, a diamond ring may be worth thousands of pounds whilst a piece of bread the same size would only be worth a fraction of a penny. If the value of an article had anything to do with its usefulness, the positions of the articles in question would be reversed. Further, an article can be very useful indeed, and yet contain no value. Thus a merchant could bring bottles of air upon the market—he might sell the bottles, but he certainly could not sell the air (except in very exceptional circumstances) though there is nothing more useful to mankind.

We have seen that an article, in order to figure as a commodity, must be useful and must contain value. We have already seen what constitutes the useful side of an article, and the question now arises, what constitutes the value side of an article?

There is a common misconception abroad that the supply of and demand for commodities determines their values. This contention is easily disposed of. The relation of supply and demand is continually altering, supply at one time being greater than demand, and demand at another time being greater than supply. As a consequence of these movements there must come a time when supply and demand balance each other. What then would determine the value of an article? Obviously not supply and demand, as the equilibration of the two would nullify their effect. Such a theory would then drive us to the absurd conclusion that the articles, at the moment supply and demand were equal, had no value! The supply and demand theory, therefore, offers no solution to value.

The value of an article is something contained in it that is only expressed when the article is put into exchange relations with other and different kind of articles. It is something different from the physical or useful properties of an article. We might look at a pair of boots for years without gaining any information as to their value. We can only find out the value of a pair of boots by putting them into exchange relation with other commodities.

The absolute value of an article cannot be determined, any more than its absolute weight. Relative weight only can be determined, and also relative value—the value of one article as compared with others. Hence the necessity for putting an article into exchange relation with another in order, by this means, to express its relative value.

As all commodities are exchangeable, though differing widely in physical characteristics and usefulness, the value property which makes them exchangeable must be one common to all commodities alike without reference to their peculiar forms or uses. Apart from their physical or useful properties there is only one other property possessed by all commodities alike, and that is—they are all the product of human labour-power applied to natural resources. It is the fact that they are all the product of human energy that enables the different kinds of articles to be put into an exchange relation with one another. Human energy is the common measurable factor of them all.

All commodities represent certain proportions of simple human energy. Skilled labour counts as a multiplication of simple energy, as in it has to be reckoned the amount of simple energy expended in making it skillful.

The average labour required to produce an article—or, to be more exact, to reproduce an article—gives it its value. Where machinery is employed in the production of one article and not in the case of another of the same kind, the value each would be determined by the value of the machine-made article. All commodities are produced for sale and competition compels producers to produce as cheaply as possible. Where out-of-date methods are used the value articles so produced only counts as the same as that of those produced by up-to-date methods—the labour that counts as value the socially necessary labour, the labour which is necessary with the prevailing resources and technique.

As human energy is not a thing that can be put into pint measures and ladled out we must ascertain the method of measuring it. The sweat caused in producing an article cannot be measured, but the time taken to produce such an article can be measured, and this is in fact the method of arriving at value, although it is done, at present, by a process behind the backs of the producers.

Human labour is measured by time. The product of one man's labour is equal to the product of another's during the same time, assuming that they have each the same skill and follow the prevailing methods with the average results.

Broadly speaking, an article is equal in value to another that takes, on the average, the same time and skill to produce.

The value of a commodity, therefore, is determined by its cost of reproduction in human labour time.

GILMAC.

To BE CONTINUED.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITORS.

Dear Sirs,

In reading your paper for the last few months one is struck with the insistence that characterises the finishing up of most of the articles, that is the capture of the political machinery by the workers, thereby obtaining control over the armed forces.

One realises that the workers' revolution will not be successful unless by the aid of the Army, Navy, and Police Force, they have stripped every vestige of power from the ruling class, thereby transforming from a functionless class to productive units of the Communist republic.

But by the mere fact of the workers getting a majority in the House of Commons and in the local council chambers will that prove all-sufficing? Because one must bear in mind that right from your infantry officer to the more high administrative posts, are recruited from the ruling class.

Consequently, is it not more than likely that by the return to the governing bodies of a majority of revolutionaries, the "property-owning class," seeing their interest menaced, would immediately utilise the forces of the Crown to crush the workers? Undoubtedly there will be a portion of the armed forces whose sympathies will be with the workers. Are they not already organising for the day? Boy Scouts, Special Police Force, comprising of the shop-keeping element, men with a little stake in the present order.

Because the political machinery is more advanced in this country than Russia or Italy, does that imply that the transformation will be more peaceful? Circumstances seem to point to the fact that the machinery to hand will be used more efficiently by the master class here, owing to their vaster political experience.

Circumstances seem to point to the necessity of the workers themselves being armed in order to crush the armed forces of the Crown before they can be supreme.

By these few remarks I do not mean to infer that parliamentary action is useless, because in any highly organised society administrative work is necessary, for the control and direction of industry, and when such is under the control of the worker, obviously some form of parliamentary procedure is required.

But what I do imply is that the workers must be organised, primarily in the workshop, for a clear class purpose—first the suppression of the armed forces of the Crown (this necessitating, of course, an armed struggle) secondly the seizure of the land, factories, etc., by the

workers and the democratic control thereof. This only shows that Parliament will only control the armed forces when the counter-revolutionary forces have been defeated.

It means that we must prepare ourselves for a hard struggle, and that at the first onset the master class will do all in their power to annul any revolutionary measures adopted by a revolutionary Parliament through the Civil Service and the officers of the Army and Navy, whose sentiments are with the powers that now be.

J. W.

OUR REPLY TO ABOVE.

Our correspondent's first error is in supposing that the officers of the armed forces and officials in administrative posts are all recruited from the ruling class. It is true that a few members of that class and some of their poorer relatives are employed in such positions, but the vast majority of both officers and civil servants are merely the professional sections of the slave class in society who depend upon the sale of their services for an existence, and are without any property worth mentioning. As this section extends its knowledge and understanding of social organisation they will steadily gravitate towards Socialism. By the time a majority of the working class are convinced of the need for Socialism, the number of the professional section who will have reached the same conviction will be sufficient to render these officials a doubtful factor for the master class to rely upon. Even the case of Russia, where conditions were much more unfavourable, gives us an example of this. Though large numbers of the old officials were anti-Bolshevik, they soon realised that they could not live without a purchaser for their services and they found that it was just as easy—in some cases, such as teaching, easier—to work under the new employers than it had been to work under the old ones.

Certainly the master class will endeavour to use all the organisations they can influence to oppose the revolution; but, useful as the Boy Scouts and Special Police may be, it must be remembered that these are unarmed bodies, and even if they were armed, as the "Black and Tans" are in Ireland, they would still be far inferior to the trained forces.

Above all, however, as our correspondent admits to some degree, there is the great factor that, when the majority of the working class are ready for Socialism, the resulting impression upon the rest of society will be so strong that few outside the wealthy capitalists and such hair-brained adventurers as they may subsidise, will be found ready to offer resistance to the revolution.

Again with reference to the trained forces—these only move according to instructions from Departments of the Government, as the War Office, Admiralty, etc., and those who are in a majority in Parliament control these Departments. Hence the absolute necessity for political action on the part of the working class.

The statement of our correspondent that "circumstances appear to point to the necessity of the workers themselves being armed in order to crush the armed forces of the Crown" is a dangerous fallacy.

Where are the workers to obtain arms? And where ammunition? How and where can they train, or how be trained, in the use of arms? The days of street barricades have gone by. The high explosive shell and the aeroplane have rendered such a method ridiculous. Also the attempt to gather arms and ammunition would be illegal, and long before it would be able to reach dimensions that mattered the authorities could handle and crush the attempt by ordinary legal means.

Only by constitutional methods can the working class obtain control of the armed forces and use them to consolidate their emancipation. No workshop organisation can effect this, and useful as such organisation may be to operate the means of production during the revolution, it can only do so under the protection afforded by Parliament. Ed. Com.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1., when regular delivery will be arranged.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF THE
SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

SIXTH EDITION,

WITH NEW PREFACE.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc.

Price Three Pence. Post Free, Four Pence
from the S.P.G.B.,
17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

A LOOK ROUND.

From a recently published book, "The Mirrors of Downing Street. By a Gentleman with a Duster," which has excited a great deal of interest, I take the following quotation concerning one of our greatest and most versatile actors, Mr. David Lloyd George, the Welsh Wizard.

The occasion was the early part of the war, when those interested in its prosecution were shrieking out that if more and more munitions were not forthcoming "we" should lose the war and civilisation would be retarded for a hundred years. The government had arranged a meeting of the principle armament manufacturers with the object of persuading them to part with their trade secrets.

Quite naturally, the assembled capitalists demurred at this. They certainly wanted to win the war, but didn't care to jeopardise their advantages in any future commercial prosperity. To the insistent demands of the military and Government officials they simply returned a verdict of "nothing doing." At this despairing moment, when all appeared to be lost, our hero leaned forward in his chair, very pale, very earnest, and very quiet. "Gentlemen," he said in a voice which produced an extraordinary hush, 'have you forgotten that your sons at this very moment are being killed—killed in hundreds and thousands? They are being killed by German guns for want of British guns. Your sons, your brothers, boys at the dawn of manhood! They are being wiped out of life in thousands! Gentlemen, give me guns. Don't think of your trade secrets. Think of your children. Help them! Give me those guns.' His voice broke, his eyes filled with tears, and his hand, holding a piece of notepaper before him, shook like a leaf. There was not a man who heard him whose heart was not touched, and whose humanity was not quickened. The trade secrets were pooled.

Quite a contrast to his attitude towards the miners, where he denies the justice of their claim for another two shillings, and calls upon the country to "resist this attack with all its strength," is given by the writer in the same book, wherein he states that in conversation with Mr. Lloyd George during the war, he (the writer) suggested that probably one cause of the unrest existing in factories was the fact that "boys could earn fifteen or sixteen pounds a week by merely watching a machine they knew nothing about, while the skilled foremen, who alone could put those machines right, and who actually invented new tools to make the

new machines of the inventors, were earning only the fixed wage of 50s. a week. 'What does it matter,' Lloyd George exclaimed impatiently, 'what we pay those boys as long as we win the war?'

* * *

The ethics of capitalism are altered to suit time and place. But property is a sacred institution anywhere and anytime—under capitalism. When the war was on our "heroes," whether they knew it or not, were fighting simply in defence of capitalist property. War or no war, the same legal machinery is used to protect property against all comers, be they miners, Bolsheviks, Sinn Feiners, Americans, or what not. The point was nicely brought out the other day when an ex-soldier got fined for shooting rabbits, despite the fact that, as the soldier pointed out, he got a Mons Star for shooting Germans!

* * *

There are many people who assert that what is needed in order to bring about a better state of life is a Labour government. Others pin their faith to the efficacy of the League of Nations. Those who use their intelligence and take a longer view have faith in neither. The adoption of either or both does not threaten the existing basis of society. We have it on the authority of Mr. J. R. Clynes, M.P. that even under a Labour government a League of Nations will be necessary, although "the more we have capitalist government the greater the need for the League." (Putney, 7.11.20.)

It would thus appear that what is necessary to the administration of the political machinery of the capitalist class will be utilised also by the labour fakery in the event of their being placed in power. Does it suggest their belief in identity of interest between capital and labour? Ask Brace.

* * *

Speaking of Labour governments, it seems we are to have one before long. Preparations are being made to pull it off at the forthcoming General Election. The unemployment situation must have affected the Government. Jobs are very scarce and the Labour Party is sore in consequence. Even the adherents of the Labour Party are beginning to lose faith in their patron saint, Mr. Lloyd George, and to wonder why it is they have been so uncharitably turned down after throwing the whole of their resources into winning the war for the British capitalists. Now they are determined that they will show the country how a government should be run.

As a preliminary we are presented with an

outline of what will happen in "the England of to-morrow" which is put forward by Mr. J. H. Thomas, M.P., a prominent Labour Party official and one of capitalism's greatest assets. Mr. Thomas tells us all about it in a book which he has published under the highly apprehensive title of "When Labour Rules." After paying a handsome tribute to the Prince of Wales as "a unifying factor to the Empire as a whole" he sets out the proposals which are expected to be realised when the Labour Party comes into power. They may be taken as embodying the aspirations of that part of the British public known as "organised labour," and whose political expression is the Labour Party.

First of all there would be an hereditary constitutional Monarchy with an Upper Chamber (sigh of relief from George); Purchase of the Liquor Trade by the Government based on a pre-war value of 350 millions, all profits to be devoted to the lowering of taxation (broad smiles on the faces of the big-bellied landlords); Old Age Pensions at 60 ("Thank God!" exclaim the old folks); Nationalisation of Mines, Railways, etc., so as to promote efficiency in various supplies and reducing prices by limiting profits (chorus: "Wot! prices coming down!")

"There will be" says Mr. Thomas, "when Labour comes into power, I hope, only one tax—income tax. . . . We should not be lavish in our expenditure for a fighting machine. But there would have to be an Army and Navy capable of backing our decisions (note this) and these would be maintained." (Sure! Col. Ward, Col. Thorne, and other Labour militarists will want jobs, won't they?) As to finance, a capital levy would be instituted, probably realising 1,000 millions. Industrial questions to be solved by "collective bargaining between the organised workers and the employers. The fiscal policy will be Free Trade "for the sake of the workmen and the sake of peace." As regards the position of women under Labourism, legislation will be sought to abolish all night work for women in industry. It will be Labour's object "as far as possible (!) to wipe out the necessity for married women working at all. When Labour comes into power, however, women will be greatly encouraged and helped in every way to enter Parliament, to join Cabinets, even to the extent of a woman becoming Prime Minister of England if she be eminently suited to and the right person for that position."

And more to the same effect. No doubt the right persons will get the right jobs. But to those who will occupy the humbler walks in

(Continued on page 62.)

extinct Tasmanians certainly did, and, as Mr. Wells points out, they were still in the early Paleolithic stage at the time they were discovered. The Bushmen and Australians, only a little further advanced, also contradict his view. Savages are almost invariably kind, affectionate, and loyal to their own people, but hostile to strangers and cruel to their enemies. Any survey of the races of men, such as Keane's or Hutchinson's, will prove this.

A serious and significant omission occurs when Mr. Wells fails to make any mention of the existence of the communal marriage system among primitive peoples. The discovery of this institution was one of the most revolutionary in the whole range of anthropology.

The reason for this omission is that our historian believes that the earliest and original form of human society was the single "self-centred" family group, ruled despotically by the oldest male, usually the father, until he died or one of his sons managed to kill him and rule in his stead. This is merely an extension to primitive conditions of the old "patriarchal theory." He quotes from Worthington Smith's excellent description of life in the early Stone Age, but, as this writer holds the contrary view of primitive society, Mr. Wells adds a highly hypothetical account of the supposed paleolithic family group and the conduct of its ruler, the "Old Man," borrowed from the "Primal Law" by J. J. Atkinson, who, with Andrew Lang, is the only authority mentioned who supports his view. (See Chap. IX. 2.)

Now Mr. Wells does not tell his readers that a very large number—probably the great majority—of ethnologists and sociologists, hold a totally different view of social origins. Prof. Edward Jenks, a very able thinker, says in his "History of Politics" (p. 18) "by the discoveries concerning the nature of savage society . . . it has been proved, that the earliest social group, so far from being a small household of a single man and his wives, is a large and loosely connected group or 'pack' . . . it could easily be shown that the origin of society in 'single families' is inherently impossible," and he refers to the view supported by Mr. Wells as "the old theory, now definitely exploded."

It is difficult to see how man could have acquired language, tools, or a developed intelligence without a considerable degree of sociability. The conclusions of modern Psychology as to the deep-rooted power of the herd-instinct and the pronounced suggestibility of the human mind also point indisputably to the gregarious nature of man.

The "Handbook to the Ethnographical Collection" of the British Museum (a cheap, well

illustrated and useful book to students) states the general opinion amongst ethnologists as follows:

Now the above paragraph flatly contradicts Mr. Wells's assertion that "No more nonsensical expression is conceivable in sociology than the term 'primitive communism.'" (Chap. XXXVII. 13.) By the use of such totally irrelevant analogies as the "dog and his bone, the tigress and her lair," he tries to prove that primitive man was an intensely individualistic property-holder.

Many readers of his work will be unaware that in taking up this position Mr. Wells is contemptuously disregarding for the benefit of his thesis the accumulated evidence of a host of competent observers in all parts of the world, and also, for the later stages of primitive communism, a considerable mass of documentary evidence. We cannot state or discuss this evidence here. The works on the subject are numerous; those by Morgan, Tylor, Lubbock and Maine will be profitable reading to the student. A good summary from a sound viewpoint is Larfargue's "Evolution of Property," and a great mass of evidence from all peoples and periods is contained in Prof. Letourneau's "Property, its Origin and Development."

These omissions and errors, unfortunately, give a distorting perspective to what would otherwise be an uncommonly vivid picture of primeval humanity. So conspicuous and important are they that their occurrence is only to be explained as a result of the preconceived theoretical notions of the author.

Mr. Wells classifies more advanced human societies into two primary types: "Communities of Will" and "Communities of Faith and Obedience." The former are societies of "free" individuals, jointly and freely determining the activities of the communities to which they belong. His stock examples are the tribes of nomadic, warlike herdsmen of the great plains. Illustrations of the second type of community are the ancient States, such as those of Egypt and Babylonia, in which a monarchic and priestly government controlled the lives and commanded the allegiance and obedience of its subjects who regarded it with fearful and religious reverence.

Now, to the Marxist this classification must appear unsatisfactory, being based on nothing fundamental. It lays no stress upon the supremely important factor of *interest*. It should be obvious that you will find no community of *will* where there is no community of *interest*. The two conditions are interdependent. One in the absence of the other is almost inconceivable.

The tribesmen of a nomadic people could

determine the activity of the community in defence, offence, or migration because their individual needs both immediate and ultimate were identical. This was easily seen and fully understood. The division of social labour had not yet reached the point at which it produces classes of oppressors and oppressed. All had inalienable "rights" in the community, membership of which was based upon actual blood-kinship. Every incentive existed to loyal action in support of the tribe.

Moreover, the fact that in a pastoral community public affairs are decided by the Council of Chiefs or assembly of tribesmen in no way alters the fact that "faith and obedience" exert a great influence on its members. The people of the tribe owe rigid obedience to the tribal custom law, and the sacred bonds of "ancestor worship" are an additional cement to that produced by unity of interest.

Now, exactly the reverse state of affairs obtained in the great communities of Egypt and Babylonia. Here diversity of occupation, social function and interest brought about by progress in agriculture, handicraft, and commerce, was the cardinal feature. There were peasants, artisans, merchants, soldiers, officials, nobles, and priests, with sub-divisions of each. (Chattel slaves, very numerous, especially in Babylonia, are expressly omitted, as they are not members of the community in Mr. Wells's sense.) The bulk of the "free" town workers had their narrow but well recognised craft interests, but those in different trades even in the same locality would have little in common. There were few amongst them who were completely propertyless, and thus no proletariat existed.

In districts where a large slave population existed—especially of gang-slaves—fear of their revolt would act as a sedative to discontent amongst the "free" workers.

These great States covered an extensive territory, and their population was large. Means of communication between distant cities and districts did not exist for the common people. There was thus little possibility of widespread revolt on the part of any exploited class. Local revolts though were not unknown—there was a "strike" of labourers at Thebes in the reign of Rameses III.—and as they were bound to conflict with the politico-religious authority they show that the common people were not so servile as Mr. Wells would have us believe.

Division of interests among the masses made possible the despotic rule of the politically intelligent minority, and the common need for protection against the inroads of barbarian invaders justified it. This minority, the "ruling class," were originally successful conquerors,

clan or tribal chiefs and "medicine men." They had at their back a disciplined army largely of foreign troops from conquered provinces. Tradition and superstition were contributory factors, but of secondary importance.

Turning to another aspect of this interesting question, as Mr. Wells says (Chap. XX. 2): "On the whole the common men were probably well content to live under lord or king or god and obey their bidding. It was safer. It was easier." Accustomed to his lot and aspiring to nothing higher than the standard of comfort it traditionally afforded, the average Egyptian peasant or labourer would submit in "faith and obedience" to what must often have seemed intolerable extortion and irksome obligations, rather than engage in any serious revolt against what must have seemed to him the mightiest, most impregnable power in the world. Such an act would do too much violence to his settled habits of work and thought, and all to no good purpose. Here also, then, *interest*, bodily and mental, is the deciding impulse.

It must not be thought that Mr. Wells entirely fails to recognise these effects of the hierarchy of classes; he does show that they are a *contributory* factor, but seems to think that it was the influence of priests and of the "god-king" idea which primarily caused men to surrender their "wills" in social affairs. The "god-king" certainly was a useful, indeed a necessary institution to primitive civilisation. Superstition, religious or secular, is always useful to class-divided societies. It gives the ruling classes a supernatural or a moral sanction otherwise absent and thus oils the wheels of exploitation.

Mr. Wells devotes a whole chapter to the rise of classes in Egypt, Babylonia, India and China and his treatment in the main is very satisfactory. Here and there throughout the book he shows very clearly the effect of class-grouping and interest as a determinant in social change.

R. W. HOUSLEY.

To Be CONTINUED.

"KNOWLEDGE IS POWER."

Economic Class at Head Office, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. (off Farringdon Road) on Thursdays at 8 p.m. Try to attend.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS
Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra.
To be had from S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

A NEW PROGRAMME OF CONFUSION.

The National Administrative Council are submitting a draft programme for adoption by the Independent Labour Party. The "Labour Leader" (Nov. 11th) in publishing the programme ask for discussion and are setting apart two columns weekly for the purpose. In order to assist the rank and file who may wish to take part in this discussion a few of the most glaring absurdities are pointed out in the following lines.

Clause one states that the object of the I.L.P. is "to end the present capitalist system." Clause two states that "the industrial organisation of society in the Socialist Commonwealth must be based upon the communal ownership of land and capital." Some hitherto obscure member might gain the limelight by asking how it is possible to end the capitalist system while retaining the thing that makes it a capitalist system, i.e., capital.

The capitalist system did not exist until wealth was used generally as capital, which obviously gave it its name. Wealth is not always capital: it only becomes capital when it is used for the production of profit, in other words, for the purpose of exploitation. When society is organised on the basis of production for use wealth can no longer be used as capital, either by individuals or collectively by the State. It remains for the N.A.C. to explain how it is possible to abolish a system while retaining the principles that form the basis of that system.

It is this absurd notion, that a totally different social system can be built up on the basis of the present system, that is responsible for the next absurdity, that under Socialism there must be two separate organisations, one to represent the interests of the consumers and the other to represent the interests of the producers. If this were true it would at once dispose of one of the strongest points in favour of Socialism. The need for two organisations to represent opposing interests would reveal the fact that society was not based on principles that made the interests of each identical with those of the whole, but that antagonism of interests between classes or sections still remained.

Under a sane system of society, where the whole of the people took part in the labour necessary to satisfy their wants, each individual would be both producer and consumer, and only a marionette showman would think of setting him up in two separate organisations in order that he might oppose and support himself

alternately in each. But even this unnecessary duplication of organisations is not enough. Clause four lays it down that there must be a co-ordinating authority made up of representatives of producers and consumers.

Clause five assumes a "transition period" during the existence of the present system, saying—

Before the final stage is reached, the Socialist movement must accept as intermediate systems only those which promote its ultimate aim: for instance, any scheme of nationalisation or municipalisation (a) must give the workers in the industry an effective control over and responsibility for its administration, (b) must tend to eliminate capitalism and prevent the creation of new means of financial exploitation, etc.

The N.A.C. are evidently much confused with regard to the meaning of the word system. The fact that the capitalists of a country may decide to buy out the capitalists of a given industry or service and run it collectively through the State, does not constitute a new system. It does not even disguise the old one, as anybody can see by examining the position of the workers in the Post Office and other institutions that have been either nationalised or municipalised.

Exploitation is effected to-day by capitalists organised in companies, trusts, combines, and groups. The individual capitalist owns shares in a company or a number of companies and draws dividends according to his holding. When his company becomes amalgamated with others the tendency is to increase the security of his shares; consequently the bigger the amalgamation the greater the security, and the biggest amalgamation is the State itself. The capitalist, however, in order that he may be assured of his dividends, must be able to control his capital, which is, for the time being, incorporated in the machinery and buildings of the company. The management of the concern is, therefore, placed in the hands of those who will run it in the interest of shareholders like himself. But whether the concern is small or large, the management must be free to run it solely in the interests of the owners; it is therefore ridiculous to suppose that the workers will be granted "effective control" over the administration of any industry. The capitalist class control because they own, but what enables them to own and control is the physical force at their command because they dominate the political machinery of the State.

The N.A.C. lays it down that the Socialist movement must only accept intermediate systems that give the workers effective control or tend to eliminate capitalism. If they wait until the ruling class offer them such systems they

will wait till the crack of doom. On the other hand, if the ruling class find it to their advantage to nationalise any industry or service, the workers will be unable to prevent them doing so while they control the machinery of government.

Clause six is entitled "immediate objects": and provides for "(a) the co-ordination and development of Trade Union organisation with a view to the securing of full working class solidarity and the obtaining of control over industry." Working-class solidarity on these lines must always be elusive because of the ever-increasing competition among the workers for jobs. But even if complete solidarity were possible control would still be beyond the reach of the workers for reasons already given.

And "(b) the strengthening and expansion of the Co-operative movement, with a view to making it the effective representative of the domestic consumer in the future Socialist Commonwealth."

Thus the number of interests that will have to be represented under Socialism continues to grow according to I.L.P. notions, because the party dare not frighten away possible supporters by exposing the futility of their freak ideas—or does a freak party attract freaks?—ideas embodied in movements that can only flourish during the present system because they promise some slight measure of relief from its hardships and poverty; though always promised without fulfilment.

Thus the N.A.C. prophesy a system made up of consumers, domestic consumers, producers and co-operators, organisations (local and national), and administrative councils representing each interest. They have not the faintest notion that when the workers have the necessary knowledge to establish Socialism, they will know how to arrange their intercourse with each other for the purpose of satisfying their material needs on the most simple and direct lines.

Production for profit is just as much the principle of the co-operative movement as it is of the capitalist system itself. The co-operative movement has been in the hands of the small capitalists for many years. But even if the ideas of its founders had been strictly followed out, and all the profits shared among working-class members, it would none the less be a system in which the producers were exploited by the members. And the fact that the producers might be members themselves would not enable them to get back anything but the smallest fraction of the results of their robbery.

The proposed international policy of the I.L.P. is embodied in clause seven, which reads as follows:

Realising that imperialism and war waged by capitalist governments constitute the greatest hindrances to the attainment of Socialism, the I.L.P. believes that it is incumbent upon Socialists to destroy imperialism and render war impossible; it therefore aims at the fullest development of the international working-class movement, at the most effective action by that movement for the prevention of war and the liberation of subject peoples, and at aiding by every means in its power, the victory of the working class in all lands.

This clause proves that the N.A.C. does not yet realise that "capitalist imperialism and war" cannot be abolished until capitalism itself is abolished. This is evidenced by their reference to subject peoples. The Socialist is only concerned with the subjection of the working class, and not at all with the subjection of one capitalist State by another. Once the workers of any country have been robbed of the results of their labour it does not matter a tinker's anathema to them whether the robbers retain their plunder, or are compelled to share it with other members of the robber class.

Clause eight is entitled "Method," and is a good example of the I.L.P. method of becoming all things to all men. It reads:

In pursuance of these objects, the I.L.P. realises that, owing to the fact that elections under the existing British Parliamentary system frequently result in false and inadequate representation, and enables governments to manipulate and thwart the national will, it may be necessary on specific occasions for the organised workers to use extra-political means, such as direct action.

The first part of this statement is altogether misleading. Under the British electoral system the workers have only to obtain a majority for Socialism over other parties and it is impossible to thwart them in their determination to establish it.

Then, without committing themselves to any "specific occasions," the N.A.C. angle for the Direct Actionists' support. If this clause is accepted by the workers, then a minority of labour members in the House of Commons, unable to enforce any measure of little or much importance, could cause endless suffering to the workers by a call for Direct Action.

In conclusion, this latest attempt to draw up a programme that makes clear the working-class position in modern society, together with the way to emancipation, is another miserable failure. It does not even show the common ground upon which the workers of all lands must unite. While prating about the exploitation of the workers, it neglects to show how this exploitation is effected, or on what basis society must be organised in order to end it.

If the rank and file of the I.L.P. intend to consider this new programme seriously, let them

compare it with the Object and principles of the Socialist Party of Great Britain, when its absurdities and shortcomings will become apparent to them and they will be fully equipped to take part in the proposed discussion. F. T.

OUR THOUSAND POUND FUND.

SIXTEENTH LIST.

Already acknowledged		£	s	d
Social		17	3	0
Tottenham Branch		30	6	6
" C. Sterber		1	1	0
" Books Raffle		1	14	0
" G.A.M. per F.F.		5	0	0
East London Branch		2	6	0
Islington		7	0	0
" Curtis		2	14	8
Walhamsoe		1	1	6
E. Jasper (Birmingham)		1	3	6
M. 13a; L. 10a, 6d. (Manchester)		10	0	0
Edmonton Branch		2	3	0
Wood Green-A. Matthews		2	6	0
" M.C.F.		2	6	0
" Book		3	0	0
" Cases		3	0	0
N.W. London Branch	Gibson	5	0	0
" Book Raffle		1	2	0
" Cases		3	0	0
"		11	9	0
Tooting Branch		3	0	0
Packer		6	0	0
Edmonton Branch		10	0	0
A.S.C. & J.		2	0	0
Brett		1	0	0
F.J.H.		1	0	0
A.G.		10	0	0
M. Baritz		5	0	0
E. Lechmere		5	0	0
W. Desborough		5	0	0
E. F. Goad		5	0	0
E. Fawcett (Cardiff)		5	0	0
Hardcastle, 1s. 9d.; Pike, 2s.; E.F., 2s. 3d., per E.F.		6	0	0
Ed. M. Mills		5	0	0
H. Clark		5	0	0
Martin		2	6	0
E. Fairbrother		2	6	0
E. H. Mihill, 2s.; Lile, 2s.; Brown, 2s.; Bird, 2s.		8	0	0
Owen (Battersea)		2	0	0
Anonymous		6	0	0
A. Lee (Manchester)		1	6	0
C.J. (Tooting)		1	0	0
A. Barker (Sheffield)		1	0	0
H. J. Jannaway		1	0	0
Total		£597	6	8

BOOKS RECEIVED

WHEN LABOUR RULES, by J. H. Thomas, M.P.
Collins. 10s. net.
AFTER THE PEACE, by H. N. Brailsford. L.
Parsons. 4s. 6d. net.
ENGLAND AND THE NEW ERA, by Brougham
Villiers. T. Fisher Unwin. 12s. 6d.

A LOOK ROUND. (Continued from page 55.)

life we can offer Mr. Thomas's consolation that "there is nothing gives so great a feeling of security and pride and stability as the owning of even a small cottage."

By far the best feature of the book is its price—ten shillings—which is prohibitive.

To sum up, we find that under a system of Labour Government there will exist capital, exploitation, wage-slavery, armies, navies, police, prisons, women labour, industrial problems, old age pensions, unemployment, wars, kings and queens, House of Lords, parliaments, prime ministers, profits, taxes, poverty, plutocrats and parasites of all kinds, either stated or implied.

All of which entitles one to ask in comparing it with the present capitalist system of government: "What is the difference?" If this is all the Labour Party can do, compare it with the Socialist object to be found in our columns, then ask yourself is it worth while bolstering up these fakers even through your trade union affiliation.

* * *

More and more does the Municipal Election take on the character of a Parliamentary Election. Labels are more or less definite and the programmes are based usually on the lines of a "national" appeal rather than a local. In the recent election a great deal of attention was paid by the "non-progressives" to such questions as Bolshevism, Sinn Fein, Socialism, Pro Germanism, High Rates and Taxes, Unemployment, "Squandering of the People's Money," etc., attributing all these "evils" to the activities of Labour representatives both inside and outside the national and local administrative bodies. Whether these had any effect on the "hard-headed and clear-thinking British working men and women" to whom the appeal was made, or not, the fact remains that out of 747 candidates put up by the various Labour organisations in 70 leading boroughs, only 199 were successful. In some of the big industrial centres like Liverpool and Bradford (where 23 in each city stood for election) not a single one was returned.

Clearly something more is needed than "Labour" has to offer if the feeling of reverence for the master class and its institutions is ever going to be eradicated from the minds of that same "clear-thinking" working man.

T. S.L.

THE NEW HEROES

The "Daily News" of October 25th published the following note and comment:

"The estate of the late Mr. Andrew Carnegie has been finally certified at 23½ million dollars (nominally £4,650,000).

"By law only half of this amount is available for public bequests, which are therefore reduced by ten millions during the life of the widow, unless she elects to make gifts.

"[When Mr. Carnegie's will was published in August, 1919, the estate was estimated at between £5,000,000 and £6,000,000. Gifts during the testator's lifetime exceeded £70,000,000. Annuities under the will included £2,000 a year to Mr. Lloyd George, £2,000 a year to Lord Morley, £1,000 a year to Mr. John Burns, and £1,000 a year to Mr. John Burt.]"

Mr. Andrew Carnegie must have been class-conscious in a very high degree to have recognised the heroes mentioned in the liberal way he has.

John Burns, Lloyd George & Co. are once more seen in their right setting, as champions of the robber class of which Carnegie was a typical representative.

Carnegie is still thought by some to be a great benefactor of the working class, because he has bequeathed a few libraries to his fellow capitalists, to enable their wage slaves readily and cheaply to take in the mental dope which is stored on those libraries' shelves.

Yes! Carnegie was class-conscious. He recognised the necessity of keeping working class minds inoculated with the poisonous matter which comprises the bulk of the literature contained in his libraries. He also recognised the valuable services which men like Lloyd George and John Burns have rendered to him and his class. The "honest John," as some used to know him—the supporter of butcher Asquith and his shooting of the miners at Featherstone. Lloyd George, the great bamboozler, the silver-tongued betrayer.

Yes! they are the Carnegie war heroes; they were the valliant supporters of the class war, waged in full consciousness by Carnegie and his fellow capitalists. Strange as it may appear, no bequests are made to the million and one heroes who bled to death, who were blown to death, who were frozen to death in the great European war just ended, to defend the property and interests of the murdering Carnegie class, the capitalist class.

Yet perhaps it is not so strange, for fellow wage slave Carnegie was class-conscious. When will you become so, and join with us in

waging the only war worth while—the class war—in order to dethrone capitalism's gang of thieves and inaugurate the Socialist co-operative Commonwealth? O. C. I.

THE ALARM.

One of the most important possessions of the average worker is an alarm clock. In most households it is handled with great care, and even reverence. Without it part of the wages of the breadwinner is in jeopardy, for tardy arrival at the workshop, factory, etc., results in the loss of a certain portion of the "reward of toil."

Notwithstanding the fact that most large workshops and factories have a bell or steam siren, the alarm clock is the household autocrat. The wives of our masters purchase them for their domestic servants, knowing that mechanical noise is necessary to combat nature when sleep has claimed the tired victim of prolonged hours of toil.

Very few members of the working class can claim to be opponents of Mother Nature, in so far as their bodies are prepared for toil hours before King Sol has reared his crest, or morning mists and fogs have disappeared. Therefore there is a constant demand for alarm clocks. The workers of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland, prior to the war, made them in thousands for sale all over the world. There was a dearth during the war, murder and munition making being the two principle industries engaging the labour of the working class, to the detriment of clock production. Now, however, the wage slaves of Europe, being back at their benches, machines, or any industry where daylight counts for nought, the alarm clock is once more obeyed. What is more, the necessity of this mechanical horror will always be recognised while the capitalist system lasts. Before you buy your next ask yourself why you need one. Perhaps its humorous or sardonic face (according to your mood) will answer, especially when the large hand points directly up, and the small hand directly down, and the furious ringing assails your dimly conscious mind.

Workers, listen! Can you not hear the alarm of proletarian insistence? Wake to it; realise your own strength and power. There is no reason why your slavery should last a day longer. But remember that the emancipation of the working class must necessarily be the work of the working class itself.

The capitalist class welcome the introduction of any reform that does not interfere with profit. Production must be for use and not for profit, and alarm clocks relegated to the home of the antiques.

W. A. G.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain.

BRANCH DIRECTORY.

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthey-st., Leichmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Crook-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to E. Jasper, Sec., 74 Murdoch-rd., Handsworth, Birmingham. Branch meets Sat. at Coffee House, Spicel-st.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Comtee. Applications to General Secy.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Secy., 142 Balwar-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Weds, Working Mens Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., J. Gallagher, 10 Sydney-st., Hanley, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to J. Lachlan, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER.—Communications to Sec., T. Hall, 48 Mayfield Grove, Gorton, Manchester.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Fridays at 8, at Exmouth-St. Schools (L.C.C.), Hampstead-rd., N.W. Communications to W. F. Tickner, 51 High-rd., Willenden-green, N.W.10.

SOUTHEAST ON-SEA.—Communications to Secy., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Secy., 62 Haverhill-rd., Balham, S.W.12. Branch meets Fridays at 143 Beechcroft-rd., Upper Tooting at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Secy. C. Stowe, 15 Culvert-rd., S. Tottenham, N.15. Branch meets Saturdays 7.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Secy., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Secy., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 21 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mares-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS
LONDON DISTRICT.

Sundays:

Clapham Common, 3 p.m.
Tooting, Totterdown Street, 7.30 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 3 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Parliament Hill Fields, 11 a.m.
Victoria Park, 11.30 a.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m. Garrett Lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's Road, 8.30 p.m.
Battersea, Messbury Rd., Lavender Hill, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junc. Clyde Rd., & Phillip Ln., 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's Hill, 6 p.m.

Published by THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, 17 Mount Pleasant, W.C.1 & Printed by A. SUCKLING, 155 High St.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.

CREST.

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments of production and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles

THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain

HOLDS—

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.